#### UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

#### NATIONAL ORGANIC STANDARDS BOARD

#### MEETING

# WEDNESDAY NOVEMBER 16, 2005

The Board met in the Captain's Room in the Channel Inn Hotel, 650 Water Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., at 9:00 a.m., James Riddle, Chairman, presiding.

#### PRESENT

ANDREA CAROE Memb	oer
110111	
DAVID CARTER Memb	per
GOLDIE CAUGHLAN Memb	oer
GERALD A. DAVIS Memb	oer
RIGOBERTO I. DELGADO Memb	oer
BEA E. JAMES Memb	per
HUBERT J. KARREMAN Memb	oer
ROSALIE L. KOENIG Memb	oer
MICHAEL P. LACY Memb	oer
KEVIN O'RELL Memb	oer
NANCY OSTIGUY Memb	oer
GEORGE SIEMON Memb	oer
JULIE S. WEISMAN Memb	oer

## ALSO PRESENT:

BARBARA ROBINSON,

Deputy Administrator for Transportation and Marketing Programs

MARK BRADLEY

Associate Deputy Administrator for Transportation and Marketing Programs

STAFF PRESENT:

BOB POOLER ARTHUR NEAL

## A-G-E-N-D-A

Call to Order
Introductions 4
Announcements 15
<b>Chair's Report</b> 17
Secretary's Report
October Executive Committee Minutes 23
National Organic Program Report 25
Deputy Administrator Robinson
Associate Deputy Administrator Bradley
Arthur Neal
Public Comment
Joe Smiley, Quality Assurance
International71
Cayce Warf, Director of R&D for Alcide and $\dots$
EcoLab
Mark Kastel, Senior Foreign Policy Analyst,
Cornucopia Institute 82
Emily Brown Rosen, Organic Research
Associates
Proxy from Lezlie Zook
Tom Harding, Agrisystems International 95
John Wood, Director Product Registration
and Compliance EcoLab Incorporated
101  Tom Hytchogon Organia Twada Aggagiation 106
Tom Hutcheson, Organic Trade Association 106 Jim Pierce, self-appointed
certifications czar, Organic Valley
Cooperative 114
COOPCIACIVE
Franz Wielemaker Dole Fresh Food Company 117
Franz Wielemaker, Dole Fresh Food Company 117 Brian Baker, Organic Review Materials
Brian Baker, Organic Review Materials
Brian Baker, Organic Review Materials
Brian Baker, Organic Review Materials
Brian Baker, Organic Review Materials
Brian Baker, Organic Review Materials
Brian Baker, Organic Review Materials  Institute
Brian Baker, Organic Review Materials
Brian Baker, Organic Review Materials  Institute
Brian Baker, Organic Review Materials  Institute
Brian Baker, Organic Review Materials
Brian Baker, Organic Review Materials  Institute
Brian Baker, Organic Review Materials

## Public Comment continued

Tom Harding on behalf of Dr. Dennis Stiffler of Coleman Natural Foods and NBC Natural Foods	
Kim Dietz for herself  Presentation and Discussion of Committee Recommendations for Sunset of the National List	174
Rose Koenig, Materials Committee	182
Michael Lacy, Livestock Committee	209
Kevin O'Rell, Handling Committee	236
Nancy Ostiguy, Crops Committee	261
Discussion re Committee Recommendation Procedures	205
Adjournment	286

#### P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1 2 9:09 a.m. 3 I'd like to call CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay. 4 the meeting to order. I guess I don't have to get too 5 close to these mikes, especially in this room. 6 still have one Board member not at the table, but 7 George is here. He got in late last night, was just 8 eating breakfast. So he will be joining us shortly. I would like to thank you all for being 9 10 here again. And good to see a full crowd, as usual. 11 Continues to be interest in this program. 12 I'd like begin just And to 13 introductions of the Board members. And if you'd just tell a little bit about yourself and maybe something 14 15 we don't know, something interesting anyway besides 16 just name and rank and serial number and what sector 17 you represent. 18 Goldie, would you like to So, start, 19 please. 20

MEMBER CAUGHLAN:

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: You don't have to. Just try to things interesting.

No.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

21

MEMBER CAUGHLAN: I guess I'm looking forward to putting a lot more time. My name is Goldie Caughlin. I'm from Seattle. I work with PCC Natural Markets, but I do not represent the retail sector. We are a food cooperative. But I'm one of the three positions that is available in some of the Boards for consumer rep. And I've done a lot of consumer work for the last 30 years in the state of Washington.

And I look forward to going back. I'm now going to be working with the Food Producers Board as well as in the state of Washington we have a joint small farm -- there's a small farm program as Washington State University and also a small farm direct marketing program with the Washington State Department of Ag. And we have formed a couple of years ago and it has solidified a joint board. And I'll be very pleased to work in regard to that board.

So I guess I'm still going to be a bored board -- no, anything but bored. I think that what's happening in our state I'm very pleased about some of the directions in terms of the organic -- the bioag, bio intensive and organic ag program which is going

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 straight ahead in Washington state. And we're 2 working on that. 3 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks. 4 Hugh? 5 Hubert MEMBER KARREMAN: My name is 6 Karreman. I'm a dairy veterinarian in Pennsylvania. Ι 7 sit here at this seat representing the environmental 8 and resource conservation contingent. My background was in resource economics and soil science, but for 9 10 the last 10 or 15 years, 15 years, I've been working 11 with dairy cows in the organic sector. 12 And most everybody that knows me 13 where I stand on things. I'm very transparent as far 14 as what I say and have my opinions, of course. 15 One of my main things that I hope to do in 16 the future is educate other veterinarians across the 17 country, livestock veterinarians about the organic 18 sector. And that's kind of my focus from this time on. 19 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks. 20 MEMBER JAMES: My name is Bea James. And I'm from Minneapolis, Minnesota, Director of National 21 22 and Organic and HPC for a 20 store chain, upscale

mainstream grocery chain. And I represent the retailer position here on the NOSB.

Everybody's giving industry news on their one unique thing. I'll just say my one unique thing is that I may dress in a tie, but I got two kids at home, one of them's name is Harvest and the other one's name is Forest. And so I do live the lifestyle.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Rigo?

MEMBER DELGADO: Harvest and Forest.

Well, I also have an interesting name, it's quite an icebreaker when you try to start a conversation. It's Rigoberto Delgado, but the user friendly version is Rigo.

I am a producer on the west side of Texas.

Been producing cotton for a number of years and now

I'm going into production of chickens. And I've been

quite successful producing eggs. So that's the latest

result from my experiment.

I'm an ageconomist by training and I have a master's in business administration. And, yes, I've done a lot of work in the corporate life but underneath in the bottom I am an organic friendly

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 person and I am very interested in working with other 2 groups of farmers there where we have our farm in west We're starting to work with other smaller 3 Texas. 4 producers in trying to get up a coop going. 5 that's the latest news in the front. 6 And in terms of interesting items, I did 7 start playing vegetarian until my children decided to 8 stop that. I think my wife agree with them, afraid. 9 10 MEMBER CARTER: Dave Carter, part of the 11 graduating class of 2006. Actually serve as the 12 consumer rep. What I do is half time I'm Director of 13 the of the National Bison Association, half time i'm founder, one of the founders of a pet food company 14 15 called Pet Promise and half time do itinerate 16 consulting. 17 MEMBER CAUGHLAN: That's time and a half, 18 isn't it? 19 MEMBER CARTER: And so the unique thing I 20 quess about me is I happen to be married to the most

the back of the room, my wife Sue today.

patient woman in the world, who is actually sitting in

21

22

Who a few

years ago I left one job because I was traveling too much and now I'm traveling about 70 percent of the time.

I guess the other unique thing is that we have some bison heifers down in Taos, New Mexico which we would like to expand and eventually get started.

MEMBER DAVIS: Hi. My name is Gerald Davis. I'm on the Board as a grower representative. I have worked in organic agriculture in vegetable farming and tree fruit production for 13 years.

And I'm kind of excited about the growth in the industry and what I see going on. I work at this time for a large organic vegetable farm called Cal-Organic as an ergonomist and a pest control advisor.

And I guess a new thing that would be nice to mention would be that the farm I work for is now owned by a larger conventional carrot farm that just this year the organic portion of it took back 1200 acres of land from them because we have too much demand for organic carrots and vegetables. And it used to be the other way, and I'm glad to see that.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MEMBER OSTIGUY: My name is Nancy Ostiguy.
2	I work in the Entomology department in Penn State.
3	I don't know if there's really anything
4	unique to say, probably most of you have noticed that
5	I have played around with my hands up here. I quilt,
6	and so there will be pieces of quilts being done while
7	I'm here.
8	The other thing I do is I do research on
9	honey bees. And we're having a lot of fun right now,
10	run sort of in the scientific sense of looking at the
11	viruses that impact honey bees. And we think we may
12	have found a virus that actually increases or can
13	impact the level of aggression in honey bees. So my
14	next thing is to try and find out whether or not that
15	virus is more prevalent in the Africanized bees. And
16	if so, we may have a way to deal with Africanized bees
17	so that they can be gentler.
18	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: That's unique
19	information.
20	I'm Jim Riddle, organic inspector and
21	educator and certifier rep from Winnona, Minnesota.
22	And I'm really honored that my wife, Joyce

Ford, is here today. And Joyce has been tremendous support, help, inspiration and at times moderating influence on me and other times she actually incites me, and I have to moderate, believe it or not.

But some of you know that Joyce and I live off the grid. We are not hooked to the electric grid, produce all of our own power, solar and wind. And my latest involvement as a volunteer in life is in my home county, Winnona County, Minnesota has formed an economic development authority and two of the projects we're pursuing is putting up a big two megawatt community owned wind generator, and then also building local food systems. So I'm looking forward to some local focus here in the coming years as well as continuing national and other activities.

MEMBER O'RELL: My name is Kevin O'Rell.

And this is my fourth year on the Board representing the handlers, processors in the industry. And I've been involved in organic for the last ten years and product development consulting and regulatory. I work for a company that produces organic soy and organic dairy products.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

I guess in my personal life my daughter just turned 14 last week and my son turns 13 next week. So he wants a guitar. So, Rigo, I think I'll send him over your way for guitar lessons. But I think my life's about to change drastically at home.

KOENIG: Hi. My name is MEMBER Rose Koenig. I'm a producer in Gainsville, Florida. my husband isn't here because I am a true producer in the sense it's a one-woman and a couple of interns Although Barbara always writes to me and says do you really -- yes. When I come in from the field I always have time to kind of write off some interesting things because it gives me a lot of time to think. So I spend my time doing manual labor and letting my mind wandering a lot of the time.

This is my last meeting, I think, officially unless we hear something different, forever and forever. So I've been thinking about that. And it's been an interesting thing.

I have also two children, one turning 8 and one turning 10. And when I think about that the 8 year old was turning 3 when I just started the Board,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

it's pretty amazing to think. You know, sometimes you look back and you think it's difficult now, but how did I take off back then and leave my husband on the farm and the two kids. Anyway, that's the information.

MEMBER SIEMON: I'm George Siemon. I'm here as a farmer rep. And I work with Organic Valley, so I don't have much of a personal life anymore. guess at this age you live through your children, and so the only thing I can say that's unique is my son's been down at Cleveland, Mississippi feeding people for 70 days, about 1500 people a day. I'm going to get to go down there next week and be there for Thanksgiving. And then the Saturday after that, the local community are going to have a thanks for giving celebration on So I've really been living through that Saturday. experience a little bit to see that Organic Valley has been sending a lot of food. So it's been a very exciting to be part of.

MEMBER CAUGHLAN: How old is that son?

MEMBER SIEMON: Twenty-five. Old.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Spoken like a true dad.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MEMBER CAROE: Hi. I'm Andrea Caroe. And
2	I'm environmental rep. And I work for a company
3	called Protected Harvest. I'm the Certification
4	Director. We certify farms to bio IPM practices.
5	They're not organic. We're trying to raise the bar of
6	conventional growers.
7	Let's see, interesting facts about me. I
8	think everybody knows me. I've been around the
9	industry for a while. I met Jim many moons ago in
10	Marquerita Hot Springs as I was training to become an
11	organic
12	MEMBER SIEMON: That was the inspector
13	training.
14	MEMBER CAROE: I have two children as
15	well. I have a 13 year old son and a 16 year old
16	daughter. And those of you that haven't reached kids
17	of age 16, I could tell you some stories after a
18	couple of drinks. But life has changed for us with
19	the driver's license.
20	Anyway, I don't have any other interesting
21	facts.
22	MEMBER WEISMAN: My name is Julie Weisman

1 from Tenafly, New Jersey. This is getting towards the 2 end of my first year on the Board. I hold one of the handler positions on the Board. 3 4 My family's business is a food ingredient 5 business. When I joined it ten years ago I brought 6 organic into it. One of our big products is organic 7 vanilla and other organic flavors. Most of our 8 business up until now has been on the conventional 9 side, and I am proud to say that there were two days 10 last month where organic shipped than conventional. 11 And I have two daughters 13 and 6. 12 yes, life has changed. I heard Kevin and I was like, 13 oh yes, I know where that is. An interesting thing about me is that I 14 15 actually, my master's degree is in social work. I was 16 a psychiatric social worker before I was in the food 17 business. 18 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: That will help you. 19 MEMBER CAUGHLAN: It'll help a lot. 20 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks, Julie. I'm Mike Lacy from Athens, 21 MEMBER LACY: 22 Georgia. I work at the University of Georgia in the

1	poultry science department. I'm the science rep on the
2	Board.
3	Had big news in my family from a children
4	perspective. I have one daughter that was married on
5	the 1st of October.
6	MEMBER CAUGHLAN: Ah, congratulations.
7	MEMBER LACY: And I survived. I have not
8	recovered.
9	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: All right. Thanks.
10	Thanks to all of you for being good sports, too.
11	Announcements, are there any Board members
12	that have any announcements to share at this time?
13	Dave?
14	MEMBER CARTER: Just to let you know, I
	FILITION CINCIDIC. Subt to let you know, I
15	will be leaving at about 11:15. I have a meeting up
15 16	
	will be leaving at about 11:15. I have a meeting up
16	will be leaving at about 11:15. I have a meeting up at USDA at 11:30. So I'll be excusing myself for as
16 17	will be leaving at about 11:15. I have a meeting up at USDA at 11:30. So I'll be excusing myself for as quick as I can to come back.
16 17 18	will be leaving at about 11:15. I have a meeting up at USDA at 11:30. So I'll be excusing myself for as quick as I can to come back.  CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: All right. Thank you.
16 17 18 19	will be leaving at about 11:15. I have a meeting up at USDA at 11:30. So I'll be excusing myself for as quick as I can to come back.  CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: All right. Thank you.  MEMBER CAUGHLAN: Will it involve a

tomorrow

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Not a live bison on the mall this time. Okay.

Any other announcements?

Yes. I would like to let everyone know that there will be two public comment sessions. One today focused primarily on the Sunset Review and the

8 afternoon on pasture. And if you haven't signed up,

recommendation.

there are separate sign-up books in the back of the

And

then

10 room. So you still can sign up.

Committee's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And if you haven't just signed in for attending the meeting here, please do so during a break or at your convenience.

It says here on the agenda Chair's Report and some comments. I guess I would like to make a few comments before we get under way.

And one thing is just on a personal note, it's been truly an honor to serve on the NOSB, and especially an honor to serve with all of you. I think that we have always operated with respect for one another, even when there have been disagreements that we have the ability to have open discussions. And I

really appreciate all of the knowledge that all of you bring to the table. So it's been an honor to serve with all of you.

And looking back, I don't know of another class, you know, of five appointees that have all stuck it out all five years. There may have been. Otherwise, usually somebody resigns for one reason or another. So it's been extra special to be a part of this group.

And, you know, we have faced various challenges during the five years that we all have this past But year has been challenging, not for the Board and our function and our functioning back and forth with USDA. I think that that actually is better than it's been during the previous times. That continues to improve, and that's very encouraging. But outside of the Board has certainly been a difficult and challenging year. You know, first with the lawsuit and then the clarifications to that lawsuit, and then draft rule changes looking at minimizing disruption from And those could only go so far; not far lawsuit.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

enough for a lot of the sector's needs so that amendments going through but not with full support or not going unified to Congress. And that certainly has left us in a very challenging position.

The one thing, you know, I think we just have a lot of healing to do as a community and, hopefully, people will commit to that. I mean the law has been changed. We do have to learn a lot yet what the ramifications of those law changes are, but there will need to be new rules written to implement those changes. And I trust that the Board will be involved, that the public will be involved. There will be proposed rules. There will be opportunities to comment and be engaged. And, you know we have an opportunity to refocus now and make sure that those rule changes really protect organic integrity and incorporate the ongoing role of the Board in that.

But one common theme that's been encouraging despite all of the rhetoric flying back and forth, one common theme in both industry and public interest group positions has been to protect and preserve the authority of this Board and to defend

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

the recommendations of this Board that have gone through the process we followed. And so I think we need to, and this Board needs to continue to live up to that responsibility.

And I look back during the five years. You know, the rule was implemented, but that was on track to be implemented when we were appointed. know, it was already out and so we just happened to be on the Board at that time. But we have done a lot of work ourselves. And among those accomplishments think having a Board policy manual in place certainly guides the work of this Board on into the future, and it a foundation document as well as the principles of organic production and handling, having those down. And the compatibility criteria that we worked hard on, took a lot of public comments, as well as the new synthetic and nonsynthetic draft. I think those are some foundation pieces that we've put in place in our time on the Board, as well as really solidify the materials review process, the evaluation documents, the statement of work for the contracts. those are very solid pieces. Have been developed in

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

cooperation with the program. And we've reviewed our share of materials. Recommended some for approval and others rejected.

But we also have put draft recommendations for standards, apple culture, mushrooms, greenhouses, have very good chlorine task force report. And some of those things still need to be implemented, but they should not be discarded or forgotten by this Board or by the program.

And we've got Sunset well underway. But a lot of the difficult work is yet to do. In a way, we've picked the low hanging fruit, so to speak, for this meeting, the noncontroversial materials. But the challenge is going to be in the coming year dealing with the materials that are being deferred at this time.

I'll just close by saying that one thing that I have seen as a responsibility as a Board member, and I think the Board has taken this up, is the Board needs to be an independent voice. Yes, we work hand-in-hand with the program but we also need to bring a perspective from the community, from the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

public to USDA to have a balance there. And so I just encourage the Board on into the future to always maintain an independent voice as needed and to stand up for the principles. Work together as a group and work together with the program, but don't be afraid to take a stand as needed.

So with that, I'll move on the Secretary's Report and Goldie is up. Just by way of introduction, in our books for this meeting we do not have the minutes meeting summary from the August meeting yet. I imagine there have been a few other things going on at the program and it's been a short time between So I would just like the transcript from meetings. this meeting to reflect that we have not yet addressed considered the minutes from the August 2005 meeting. Those will need to be reviewed and adopted at the next meeting.

#### Goldie?

MEMBER CAUGHLAN: Well, I think the only thing I would add is that I apologize, but I have not transcribed the executive minutes from September. Sorry. That will be getting done before I caught up

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 in the Sunset. 2 By the way, I just have to come back in here and talk about my kids and my grandkids. 3 4 I have been spending more time with my 5 grandchildren, certainly, because in the time that 6 I've been on this Board I've added two more to the 7 I now I have six incredible grandkids from 3 8 months to 10 years. They're pretty much under foot a great deal of the time, and that's wonderful. 9 That's 10 the way I like it, too. So, thank you. 11 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay. 12 MEMBER CAUGHLAN: I'm the Secretary, and 13 that's the report. 14 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: And you're sticking to 15 it. 16 MEMBER CAUGHLAN: And I'm sticking to it. 17 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: But we do have minutes 18 from Executive Committee call from October 14th. I 19 think Dave and Bea worked together to capture those 20 minutes. And I guess I would like to ask if the Executive Committee members to consider approval of 21

those minutes, since they're in the book at this time.

1	Julie?
2	MEMBER WEISMAN: I just wondered if the
3	minutes could be amended to reflect the fact that I
4	was also on that call?
5	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay. And so we'll need
6	to revise those and resubmit an electronic copy.
7	Any other changes to those draft minutes?
8	Hearing none, is there a motion to approve, and this
9	would be a vote by the Executive Committee members?
10	MEMBER CAROE: I'll motion to approve.
11	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Andrea move to approve.
12	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second.
13	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Nancy seconds.
14	Further discussion? Hearing none, all in
15	favor say aye.
16	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.
17	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Those opposed? All
18	right. Thanks. We have those approved. So we still
19	need to come back at the next Executive meeting,
20	hopefully, and consider the minutes from September
21	Exec meeting. Okay.

Next up we have the NOP report. And I'm

not sure who is going to go first. Barbara. And once again, if you'll introduce yourself for the record, please?

DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR ROBINSON: Barbara Robinson, Deputy Administrator for Transportation and Marketing Programs for the Ag Marketing Service.

And welcome, everybody.

As part of the update but before we get started, I have just a couple of housekeeping things, well one housekeeping announcement and one rather sad announcement.

First of all, the reason you don't see Katherine here, her niece was killed in an automobile accident last Friday, and this is a niece who is very near and dear to her and her family. And Katherine just couldn't be here. I don't really even want to go into the details, but she had to go and take care of arrangements for the family. So she just couldn't be with us here today and sends her regrets.

Just as a matter of housekeeping if you hear a lot of planes and a lot of noise, because we are on the river, the next couple of days NORAD is

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

conducting exercises to mimic the post-9/11. So don't get nervous if you hear and see a lot of planes when you go outside. They're just trying to protect us, I guess, or something. So just thought I'd like you know that for people who are out-of-towners. Those of us who are here sort of get used to that stuff.

Now, I'm going to turn this back to Jim very briefly and then he's going to come right back to me, but Jim has an announcement to make because the first on the matter of update that I want to discuss deals with dairy pasture. Jim and I, and I've had several conversations with several of you on the Board but Jim is the Chair, and so in deference to the Chair and what the Department has agreed to do, it asked Jim to go ahead and make the announcement. So, Jim?

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Yes. Okay. Thanks, Barbara.

You know, we are having a public comment period tomorrow on the pasture issue and the program posted a request for comments for tomorrow's public input session. But the Livestock Committee will be considering a new draft that I have compiled that

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

really pulls together all previous existing recommendations on pasture, and they date back to 2000, and then 2001 and then we've had some earlier this year. And so there will be a Livestock Committee meeting after we recess today to consider that new draft. And then that will be presented tomorrow morning during Committee Chair reports on ongoing work plan items. But we will not be moving for a final vote by the Board because even though this doesn't contain new concepts, the draft itself has not been posted for a round of public comments. And that's something that I'm always committed to is a public comment because very soon I'll be on the other side of this microphone. But I just believe that that is also part of our responsibility.

But there is a new draft and it was circulated fairly widely so a number of people and all Board members have seen that. And there's a copy of that draft in addition to your meeting book.

So that's kind of where the Board action.

And in discussions back and forth with Barbara my understanding is the program is committing to move

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

forward with an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking, or ANPR. Hopefully to be out by the end of January, but that's just a target. But it will be based on the existing recommendations of the Board and drawing from this draft, which really compiles all of those as well as the public comments that we've received and will receive tomorrow.

It's anticipated that there will be a 60 day public comment period on that ANPR. And during that time the program and the Board hope to organize a symposium or listening session somewhere in either upstate New York or Pennsylvania, or in dairy country to hear from dairy nutritionists, dairy producers, veterinarians on the importance of pasture for ruminant animals and directly in response to what is in that ANPR.

So I think we are making progress. It certainly has to be a thoughtful process to change the rules. But I see that progress is being made or there is a commitment to move forward based on existing recommendations.

DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR ROBINSON: Right.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Yes.

DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR ROBINSON: I want to get through all these rapidly because this is your Sunset meeting.

We have completed the interviews for the Executive Director position and we'll be getting back to you. We asked all of the questions that you submitted to us. And we want to put all the answers together on some kind of a spreadsheet so we can get back to you with those and give you our feedback, and then get your reaction to the candidates. And we want to get that done as soon as possible.

I'm not going to be here all next week. I haven't had a day off, literally not one day off, since the hurricanes hit. So I'm taking a day off next week. In fact, I'm taking all of them off.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Can you leave your cell phone number?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR ROBINSON: No. No. But we'll get something to you, hopefully, next week. I don't know how fast we can get that spreadsheet put

together, Mark. I can tell you personally who I would recommend, and I think you'd be pleased with that. But, at any rate.

On the NOSB nominees, the package is across the street with the Secretary. And just for information because I hear this all the time, we get letters from folks, I thought I would just like to tell you -- where are my notes? What kind of, what we We received over 50 nominations from people. do. We went out with 11,000 solicitations. We sent postcards and solicitations to every certifying agent. Here we Every single certifying agent in the United States, every organic producer and handler, all of the 1862 land grant colleges, all the historically black land grant institution in Tuskegee University, the entire National Directory of Farmers Market and Direct Marketing Associations, NRCS, California Federation of Certified Farmers Markets, the North America Farmers Direct Marketing Association, Farmers Market Online, National Association of Farmers Markets, Farmers Market Association, Pacific Coast Market Association, Washington State Farmers Market

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Association, Anacortes Farmers Market, Bainbridge
Island Farmers Market and the Black Farmers and
Agriculturist Association.

We solicited USDA's Farm Services Agency outreach programs, which consist of African-American, Asian Pacific Islanders, Hispanic Americans, American Agro Women Affiliates, Women Watch Group, Women in Agriculture, Women's Agricultural Network, Women's Food and Agricultural Network, Rural Womens Network and Women's Food and Agricultural Network.

So it's not like we just, you know, posted in the Federal Register. I want you to know that we really do try to get out there and canvas everywhere. And we did get over 50 nominations.

And I think we got a good selection of candidates. And when we forward the package across the street to the Secretary, we don't leave anything out. Everything we get goes to him. Absolutely everything. Everything that everybody sends in along with every single of recommendation. He gets it all, every bit of it. We don't hold anything back. So the package that went to the Secretary was about two

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	feet think.
2	Because we had a resignation, a vacancy,
3	he has to select all three consumer representatives,
4	the certifying agent representative and two producer
5	representatives. So we'll hopeful that he'll make
6	that selection soon so that we can seat the new Board
7	members quickly as they need to be seated.
8	MEMBER CAUGHLAN: Barbara, excuse me?
9	DEPUTY DIRECTOR ROBINSON: Yes.
10	MEMBER CAUGHLAN: In the past it's
11	Goldie.
12	DEPUTY DIRECTOR ROBINSON: Oh, there you
13	are. Okay.
14	MEMBER CAUGHLAN: Right. Respectfully I
15	would say that in the past two or three rounds we have
16	been taken into consultation on a short list for
17	responses from two regarding appointments. Is that
18	not to be the case this time?
19	DEPUTY DIRECTOR ROBINSON: That's always
20	the Secretary's prerogative, Goldie.
21	MEMBER CAUGHLAN: Right.
22	DEPUTY DIRECTOR ROBINSON: I don't have

1 any say over it. 2 MEMBER CAUGHLAN: I see. 3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR ROBINSON: And so every 4 Administration or every Secretary chooses whether or 5 not to do that. And this Secretary has not elected And the previous Secretary did not elect to. 6 So 7 I just, you know, I can't say to them now you really 8 need to do this. Call it what you will, I just don't 9 quite have the nerve to go to the Secretary and say 10 you really out to post all these. So that's just 11 simply their prerogative to do. 12 CAUGHLAN: No indication MEMBER that 13 that's going to happen then? Thank you. 14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR ROBINSON: No. 15 Let's see, oh, obviously since we last met 16 have hard Mark Bradley as the Associate Deputy Administrator. 17 18 (Applause). 19 DEPUTY DIRECTOR ROBINSON: Mark has 20 already discovered a phrase that I decided I hate. continues to insist that this job is fun. And if he 21

says it one more time, I'll smack him.

1	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Barbara?
2	DEPUTY DIRECTOR ROBINSON: But as long as
3	he thinks it's fun, that's good.
4	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Barbara?
5	DEPUTY DIRECTOR ROBINSON: What?
6	MEMBER OSTIGUY: It's better than the
7	alternative.
8	DEPUTY DIRECTOR ROBINSON: This is true.
9	This is true. But Mark does bring a wealth of
10	experience, as many of you know, to this job. And I'm
11	very, very pleased for him to have assumed this
12	position and look forward to working with him. He's
13	got a lot of good ideas. I think he's going to do a
14	lot of the things that this Board has wanted for a
15	very long time. And has already put in place a lot of
16	the procedures that you have asked for. And so I
17	think you'll be happier as a Board and we certainly
18	will be happy, too.
19	In fact, after I'm done I'm going to turn
20	this over to Mark.
21	Now just very quickly, and I do mean
22	quickly because we're in a state of flux about this,

we had a long discussion in August about sort of where were we on the lawsuit. Now Congress has come along and they've passed H.R. 2744, the appropriations for the fiscal year 2006, which has been signed in the last week by the President. And that appropriations bill did contain the rider which changed the Organic Foods Production Act.

Now, what does that mean? We are still looking at that. But the bottom line is we still do have some rulemaking to do to comply with the court order that we were bound by as a result of the Harvey lawsuit. For example, Congress did not do anything with the 8020 feed provision and the court still said that that was illegal. So we are in contact with the U.S. Attorney in Maine and he still our legal counsel through the Department of Justice. And so we are bound to reply to the court by June 2006. We can't just say oh well Congress passed a law so I guess we can just ignore the court. We can't do that. We still have to in effect closeout our dealings with the District Court of Maine and our U.S. Attorney will advise us how best to do that.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

My guess is, and again like I told you in August I'm not a lawyer, my guess is that a lawyer will say we'll have to comply with whatever Congress didn't touch and that where Congress monkeyed somewhat with what the court did, we may have to go back to the court and petition for some sort of relief or something and reconcile where there is between what the court told us to do and then what Congress came along and kind of undid or contradicted in some fashion.

The bottom line to all of that is for USDA we have rulemaking to do regardless. The question is in what time frame will we have to complete this rulemaking. Obviously, since Congress may have overridden what the court has done, we won't have to do rulemaking by 2006. The bottom line for industry is it's back to business as usual for industry with respect to the National List. That has been restored current state for the 38 materials, the or depending on how you count, I mean I've seen 36, and 38 materials counted on that list. National List is the National List. And everybody had

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

until June 2007 anyway before life changed.

So if anybody came to me and said what should I do, I would say go on about your business and wait for the Department. The Department needs to issue a statement. We have not done that yet because we are waiting for good legal counsel to tell us how we have to proceed and what our determinate deadlines are. And as soon as we get that we will be, I'm sure, required by the Secretary and by legal counsel to issue a statement publicly. Something that goes on our website and something that is cleared and either issued by the Secretary himself or his office, but we will have to issue a statement publicly. And my advise to my superiors will be the sooner we issue something, the better.

So we are in the process right now of preparing the factual talking points. Putting something together that ready for clearance. So as soon as our legal counsel tells us here's what you're going to have to do, we've got all of the guts of it ready to go and all we need to do is insert the deadlines.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

The one thing that Jim made a point at the beginning in his remarks and the one thing that I think we can definitely agree on from the Department's point of view, you know whatever our statement contains, I can tell you this: It will be a statement for the facts, here's what Congress did, here's how Congress may have changed the law and how it may be different from what the court did. We'll leave the did what political pundits of who to whom and misconceptions out there to other people. That's not job. the thing our However, one that will reiterate, as Jim said, is the role of this Board. And the role of this Board was not changed either by the court or by Congress. The Secretary has no authority to put a synthetic on the National List. And that is one thing I want to clear up right here and now.

I've heard this, I've heard this I don't know how many times in different times. Congress did Secretary any authority to not give the synthetic on the National List anywhere. Not So I've never heard a Board member anywhere. that, by the way. I'm certainly not saying that. But

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I've heard it in the press. I've heard people say it.

That's not true. That is absolutely not the case.

heard Jim make that I fully agree with, any rulemaking that will be done will be done collaboratively with the Board and with the public. We don't do rulemaking without going through a public notice and comment process. That is illegal. And I, for one, personally as long as I'm the Deputy Administrator, ain't going there. So we're going to have an open above board transparent discuss it, very collaborative process. Not just with you on the Board but with the public. It's not worth anything else. So, that's what we're going to do.

It's just a matter of getting our ducks in a row, finding the time line and getting there. But your role has not changed.

Now I'm going to go to Mark and he can update.

ASSOC. DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR BRADLEY: Boy.

Thank you, Barbara. And thank you for this job.

It's fun.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Your name for the record, please?

ASSOC. DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR BRADLEY: My name is Mark Bradley. I'm the Associate Deputy Administrator?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR ROBINSON: Yes.

ASSOC. DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR BRADLEY: Got a little title creep going on in D.C. I used to be the Program Manager, but I think they've changed all that and this title is much more vague and less descriptive, but it sounds important. But really all I still do is manage the staff and try to keep work going through the NOP. Trying to make sure that everything gets done that needs to get done, and try to set up some kind of a management strategy that will have to be my own. Each of my predecessors, Keith one of them, Rich Matthews has had their own style about how they dealt with people and programs and progress through the NOP. And I'm looking forward to putting my own little spin on that.

And, as Barbara said, there are some things that the Board has been pushing for that I will

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

be pressing for myself. You may know, I come from a
long line of quality system audits and background
especially with the ISO 65 program. So I'll be
looking to inject a lot of that management strategy
into how the NOP is handled, how we get some kind of a
cycle of continuous improvement, transparency in
processes, accountability, record keeping. Those are
the kind of things when you're trying to implement a
new rule, as you know we've been trying to do for the
last few years, sometimes in the process of just
getting everyone accredited and getting things settled
down and implemented, we have a little bit more of a
luxury now having gone through the work that this
Board, especially the graduating class of 2006, has
done. It's settled a lot of the issues that we can
start getting down to some work as far as quality
systems management and establishing a routine that
people know what to expect. Board meetings at regular
times, you know, addressing regular issues. Planned
well advance. I think this is the rose colored glasses
that Barbara was telling you I was looking through,
but I'm looking forward to doing all that.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 And thanks for -- I hope I can live up to 2 her expectations of me. 3 The first thing before I get into the 4 report, Barbara mentioned that we just had a nice 5 round of interviews with candidates for the Executive 6 Director's position. It was a lot of fun and it was 7 fun -- oh, I didn't say that, did I? I love this job. 8 That's the other one. The other one you may hear on occasion is all I ever really wanted to do is sell 9 10 vegetables by the side of the road. Somebody I'm going 11 to be able to do that, too. I'll hire you 12 MEMBER KOENIG: if you 13 resign. 14 ASSOC. DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR **BRADLEY:** 15 Thank you, Rosie. 16 But the questions that the Board 17 together on very, very short notice; thoughtful, they 18 were interesting. I think the people that were 19 interviewed enjoyed answering them. They gave a lot of 20 detailed insight. They were the primary questions that we used. There were six questions. We kept very 21 22 And I think the product is something copious notes.

that you're going to be interested in, perhaps, perpetuating.

That level of involvement was a good level for the Board, too. It could have got cumbersome if, you know, you had wanted to seat a panel and had to be sworn to secrecy and drug the process out. But that allowed maintain privacy for the us to some candidates. There were some folks there that, you know, when you apply for a job and you interview you take a little bit of a chance that those that don't get selected have to go back and work for whoever they were working for. So they were able to maintain some But I think you will be pleased with the product that you'll have a chance to look at and comment on, and we'll consider that.

I know that you're familiar with the folks that normally sit at the table up here. Bob Pooler and Keith Jones, Arthur Neal, Merideth Wilson up here. There are a few folks that are new on the staff.

J.D. Melvin in the back. If you could stand up, J.D.? Any certifiers that are calling in, don't call me anymore, call J.D. You're welcome to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	call me anytime, but J.D. will be handling a lot of
2	the traffic that comes through. He and Mary Lou Lusby
3	will be contacts for the accreditation staff. Those
4	are functions that I held in a former life, and
5	hopefully can move on. J.D. is very highly qualified.
6	He has about 20 years in government service working
7	with commodities certification type programs. And he
8	will be a good person to groom into that position, and
9	he is functioning in there now. Has really picked up
10	the ball.
11	Mary Lou Lusby handles the record keeping,
12	the movement of documents. Is very meticulous. Has
13	set up tracking systems where we can do a very good
14	job keeping track of who is sending in updates and the
15	materials that have to come through the program on a
16	regular basis.
17	We have a new writer editor, I didn't know
18	if you wanted to introduce him. Mike Smith.
19	DEPUTY DIRECTOR ROBINSON: Mike Smith is
20	here.
21	ASSOC. DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR BRADLEY: He's
22	the newest person on the staff up here. And he doesn't

work for me, he works for Barbara. But we're looking forward to having him putting some policy on our documents and really I know he's going to be a big asset for Barbara in their shop.

Jim has asked specifically for an update on the state cost share programs. I don't know if that usually happens at this meeting, but I was glad to provide that. Bob Pooler, who is our state person, and he put together some talking points.

There are two programs for the cost share program. The AMA program, the Agriculture Marketing Assistant program was targeting 15 states and it's part of the Federal Crop Insurance Act. And there were 15 states that were historically had not participated as much with the Federal Crop Insurance program. So there was a million dollars obligated annually to support this program.

Thirteen of the 15 states routinely participate. The other two states, Delaware and Rhode Island participation, lack of producer participation is reason that they're not participating in it, although they could. The funds for that, since 2001,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	they've had an average \$373 provided to 1150 producers
2	who have participated in the program. A total average
3	dispersement of \$430,000.
4	Now the other program, the national
5	program is geared toward, it's a one time allocation.
6	And all the funds for that have been finally
7	distributed or obligated, rather. In March of 2005 the
8	final \$2.1 million had been obligated on that. As of
9	that date the funds that had been used by 6100
10	producers for an average benefit provided \$475.41.
11	Is that the level of information you
12	needed on that, Jim? Does that help. Much detail?
13	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Yes. And then the other
14	part is remaining funds in the national I
15	understand you said they've been obligated.
16	ASSOC. DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR BRADLEY: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Do you have a handle on
18	what's still in the account as a total?
19	ASSOC. DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR BRADLEY: The
20	funds have been obligated. We haven't, I don't think,
21	heard back as far as those were actually used and
22	dispersed. And the figures that we have are as of

1	March 2005.
2	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay. And then if a
3	state has used all of their funds, is there a
4	possibility to request a reallocation of some
5	remaining funds that may not have been used by other
6	states?
7	ASSOC. DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR BRADLEY: I
8	don't know if that
9	MR. POOLER: That can only occur if states
10	don't utilize their funds.
11	This is Bob Pooler. We're getting reports
12	back about how states are utilizing the funds. If
13	states are showing or exhibiting the fact that they're
14	not using funds, we will request funds back from that
15	state so another state that is in need of funds can
16	use it. But we're not at that level yet. We're now
17	getting reports as to what their activity is. So I
18	imagine sometime early in the spring we may know more
19	information.
20	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay.
21	ASSOC. DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR BRADLEY: All
22	right?

1 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Yes. Thanks. Got that. 2 MR. NEAL: Now for those of you who can 3 focus your attentions to the west --CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: And you are? 4 5 Arthur Neal. We'll begin to MR. NEAL: 6 see the sunset on the NOP report. 7 I just want to update you on materials. 8 With respect to Sunset requests or requests 9 technical evaluations, we have received the reports 10 flavors, spices and oxytocin. You will 11 receiving them as soon as get back to the office, 12 probably tomorrow. After the meeting I'll email these 13 out to all of you. So by the time you get home, you'll have them to review. 14 15 The requests for newspaper aquatic plant 16 humic acid and fish emulsions, had extracts, 17 received. They needed some more work. So additional Once we receive them, 18 work will be done on those. 19 you'll get them back. They weren't in shape to send 20 forward to you. 21 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Just a question on that 22 to be clear. Does the Board need to do more work in

1	clarifying that or
2	MR. NEAL: You will have an opportunity to
3	do that.
4	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Yes.
5	MR. NEAL: But it didn't meet our standard
6	of even sending it forward to you.
7	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay. Okay.
8	MEMBER KOENIG: Okay. So are we doing
9	that same process then with these? You give us a week
10	to evaluate to see if they're technically okay.
11	MR. NEAL: Right.
12	MEMBER KOENIG: We give you the okay.
13	MR. NEAL: You got 21 days.
14	MEMBER KOENIG: Okay.
15	MR. NEAL: Twenty-one days to see what
16	extra questions you have. If it meets the standard.
17	If you want to see something in addition, you can make
18	another request and we send it back out. But before
19	we got to that point for the four that we sent back,
20	we didn't think that they were even ready for you to
21	make that type of decision.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay.

1 MR. NEAL: Okay. 2 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: All right. Thank you. 3 We have sent forward a request MR. NEAL: chlorine materials for crops 4 processing 5 livestock. 6 We have sent forward a request for -- no, 7 we have not sent forward a request. There were two 8 more substances, streptomycin. 9 DEPUTY DIRECTOR ROBINSON: Yes. And 10 tetracycline. 11 And tetracycline. They have NEAL: 12 been sent forward. But they got so much on their 13 plate, we may end up transferring that request another contractor. 14 15 There's been a lot of talk about NOP as 16 behind in petitions. We are. We do have a backlog of petitions, but it's not as 17 great as many people 18 The only reason why we haven't moved a lot believe. 19 of petitions for it is because the we've got 20 contractors working on Sunset technical evaluations. So it's hard for them to do all of them at the exact 21

same time.

So, just an update. We have a petition for sulfuric acid as a pH adjuster in the processing of manure. That petition has been moved forward for technical evaluation, so we hope to receive a report by the technical contracts by mid to late January, although with the reports for Sunset.

Propionic acid has been petitioned for use as a feed preservative. We're sending that forward.

Gellan gum has been petitioned for use in processing. We're sending that forward.

Lime mud was one that was petitioned back in the fall. We have the report on that and we have sent that report out to Committee members last year. We'll send it back out again because I know there's a lot that's transpired since then. And we'll still need to hear feedback whether or not if the report meets the standard.

for received a petition We've sodium laurel sulfate for in production. use crop The Committee and I had talked last year about this particular substance. And the Committee said already approved for use on the list as herbicidal

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	soap, but there's a restriction on it. This petition
2	wants the restriction to be modified. So we're going
3	to move that forward.
4	In the recent months we have received
5	three petitions for 606 items, spices, lecithin and
6	pectin. These are all on hold until we can work out
7	criteria for how to evaluate the additional removal of
8	an item on 606.
9	We've also received a petition of sea salt
10	onto the National List and pelargonic acid.
11	MEMBER CAUGHLAN: What.
12	MR. NEAL: Bob may have to help me on this
13	one. I think it's P-E-L-A-R-G-O-N-I-C. Is that
14	right, Bob? Yes. Short chain fatty acids.
15	And that's a short update on where we are
16	with respect to materials. Okay.
17	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Rose?
18	MEMBER KOENIG: Where is the status of the
19	because one of the reasons like with the soy
20	protein isolate that you didn't mention that's been on
21	hold has been and even for most of these, the
22	synthetic/nonsynthetic document, what's the status of

that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. NEAL: Good question.

MEMBER KOENIG: Because it's going to be tying us up on any of these technical reviews until we can really do the job we want to do and make sure we're consistent.

MR. NEAL: Good question. The document is still under review. The nonsynthetic/synthetic document is still under review by the Department by the program. We hope to have a response by early So you'll have it well spring on that document. enough review those materials in time to recommendation. That's the goal.

It's not a simple thing in reviewing the document. What we're finding is that some of the terms that were even used don't even match up to other federal regulations, like substance. The definition of substance that's in that document doesn't include food. FDA has a definition of substance that it includes food. So there's some things that we have to work out. Because whatever we do, it has to be universal that we can apply it across the board.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Hugh?
2	MEMBER KARREMAN: Question what my
3	question will be, Arthur?
4	MR. NEAL: Yes, sir.
5	MEMBER KARREMAN: About the livestock
6	materials, any updates on that?
7	MR. NEAL: Thanks for reminding me, Hugh?
8	MEMBER KARREMAN: Have they come from FDA
9	and all that?
LO	MR. NEAL: Yes. I've left off the dockets
L1	altogether.
L2	Comment period closed for the crops and
L3	processing docket on yesterday. There have been
L4	comments posted to the website.
L5	The livestock docket, unfortunately, has
L6	come back to NOP once again for additional work. We
L7	thought that it was wrapped up. We just got it back.
L8	And so we'll start working on it at the close of the
L9	meeting to get back into Agency review to get through
20	the lawyers.
21	Yes, sir?
22	MEMBER KARREMAN: Could you let us know

1	what's wrong at this point that they're looking for?
2	MR. NEAL: They've got questions
3	concerning you have the applications of FDAs,
4	AMDUCA, which is the Animal Medicinal
5	MEMBER KARREMAN: Drug Use Clarification
6	Act.
7	MR. NEAL: Right. And one of the issues
8	is that there are a number of substances that were
9	recommended by the Board that had no approved
10	livestock use but were only approved for use in
11	humans. And so, yes, they were
12	MEMBER KARREMAN: They're technically
13	approved for, let's say, equine or non-lactating dairy
14	cows but they are approved for livestock?
15	MR. NEAL: Right. But at the same time
16	there's a restriction on FDA on some of those
17	materials. It says for use in non-food animals.
18	MEMBER KARREMAN: That's correct, but
19	that's where the AMDUCA would kick in.
20	MR. NEAL: Right.
21	MEMBER KARREMAN: Right.
22	MR. NEAL: But what our lawyers want us to

1	do is to get clarification that there is no approved
2	animal drug that could complete the same task that the
3	one that you all have recommended. And AMDUCA
4	requires that.
5	MEMBER KARREMAN: I realize there's a
6	algorithm for that. And if you need any help, I'm
7	happy to help you with that.
8	MR. NEAL: Well, we'll be in contact
9	because this is something that we just got back. And
10	these are the hoops that we got to jump through to
11	make sure that everybody understands that what we'll
12	doing is legal. Because if the average consumer says
13	well this thing isn't approved by FDA for use in
14	animals, in food producing animals, but they're
15	recommending it when it's only approved in use for
16	humans?
17	MEMBER KARREMAN: Some of them are
18	approved for, let's say, ruminant livestock less than
19	20 months of age.
20	MR. NEAL: Yes.
21	MEMBER KARREMAN: I realize what you're
22	saying, but it's not really a human verse animal

1	thing. I think it's more the annotation on the label
2	of the medicine itself. I think there's a little more
3	leeway than perhaps
4	MR. NEAL: There may be from a
5	veterinarians perspective. But when you go to FDA
6	regulations and how they have approved the drug,
7	especially like this new substance h ow do you
8	pronounce it? That's not an FDA animal approved drug.
9	That's
10	MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay.
11	MR. NEAL: But we don't want to get into a
12	discussion during this period.
13	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: There will be a
14	discussion back and forth.
15	MR. NEAL: Correct. Unfortunately.
16	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: But not today.
17	MR. NEAL: Right.
18	MEMBER KARREMAN: It's been a while.
19	MR. NEAL: Yes, I know.
20	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: I'm glad you brought it
21	up.
22	MR. NEAL: Methionine has been added back

onto the National List.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: That's final rule.

MR. NEAL: As a final rule.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: For three more years,

right?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. NEAL: 2008, correct.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: 2008.

MR. NEAL: Yes, ma'am?

MEMBER KOENIG: The other document, don't know if you've considered it or you're reviewing it, but reorganization of the list by the OFPA I don't know if you've done any analysis categories. And then, I mean, we can hold off this on that. question for Sunset, you know, in terms of your answer but I'll ask during that little Sunset review section after lunch. But I'll let you think about it now. Is the question we had whether or not things that might not be approved for Sunset if we have a technical report, can we go ahead and -- if we needed a change in annotation, I'm talking about materials where the question is maybe in an inappropriate annotation, we had asked that at a Executive Committee call whether

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

if we have the technical report, if we could go ahead and leave it until 2007, not approve it for Sunset. But then relist it with a different annotation.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  NEAL: Let's talk later, because I'm not clear on the question.

MEMBER KOENIG: Okay. Okay. And then the OFPA category, too.

Right. OFPA categories is also MR. NEAL: review by the lawyers as well. It's the language issue. What's considered a production aid, can that production aid category be extended to mean anything. And one of the things that you have to take into consideration is if production aid -- if the category production aids is a catch-all category, that means that synthetic fertilizer now could probably be on the National List with no problem. So, there's some questions that you got to think about legally, and we need guidance on it. We can't answer it, say, what does this production aid category mean. Does it wipe out all of the other prohibitions in OFPA? And I can't give you that answer. So it's under review. And we hope to have a response for you by the spring.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

For those things that you recommended at the last meeting, we really hope to have responses by the spring meeting. And we'll be on consultation with you prior to the meeting, well enough in advance so that no one will be caught off guard.

MEMBER KOENIG: Because a lot of those documents we're finishing up and we're going officially off the Board, how do you expect to handle the wrapping up of those documents? I know we won't vote on it because we wouldn't be members. But we would be consulted?

I guess my great fear is that, you know, you get five new people on and these documents that have been in the pipe for a while, just losing that consistency.

Well, this is my vision. MR. NEAL: The members probably won't be appointed they probably will be appointed before the next meeting, hopefully. However, in the interim you're still going to have to work on the documents prior to the meeting. You may not vote at the meeting, but you'll have great input before the meeting. And because of the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

complexity of many of the issues being dealt with in the documents, we look for many of you to still be engaged in the discussions. And there's nothing wrong with that. You just may not have the vote. That's it.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay. Thanks.

Any other questions?

MR. NEAL: Oh, Mark's got one more update.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay. Well, thanks,

Arthur.

Mark?

ASSOC. DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR BRADLEY: Just one other thing that I wanted to add in, Jim. As part of the new management cycle I was alluding to, we're setting up a regular training period during January and February. And we're going to try to scatter these out around the country. I don't know what kind of international training we're going to get to do this year. But for the U.S. we've got training locations being set up for California, Colorado, Wisconsin in the northeast somewhere.

The two events that we're firm on right now in conjunction with the EcoFarm Conference at

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Asilomar, we're going to be training on January 25th.
2	And that is the day before the kick-off happens in the
3	evening on that event. So we're having some training
4	out there. And that's firm.
5	And also in Wisconsin on February 23rd in
6	LaCrosse at the Upper Midwest Organic Farming
7	Conference.
8	Those two events are firm and then we're
9	working on the events possibly one in Denver in
10	cooperation with Colorado Department of Agriculture
11	and also in the northeast somewhere.
12	MEMBER JAMES: Mark, could you elaborate a
13	little bit on exactly what the content of the training
14	is going to be focused on?
15	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: And these are accredited
16	certifying agent trainings.
17	ASSOC. DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR BRADLEY: Yes,
18	for accredited certifiers.
19	Every year as part of our quality
20	management system we do an analysis of all the
21	nonconformances that we've identified for certifiers
22	through the course of the year. The audit review and

compliance staff conducts their audits worldwide now.

And we analyze what they're finding to identify a need for training. It's part of the regular ISO system.

So what we've identified this year, we have identified key processes that need to have attention paid to them. First is going to be the certification process in general, the sequence of events and make sure everyone's clear on how the regulations read and what the standard for applying that is.

seeing for materials We're need evaluation to make sure that when they have authority to address a material issues or when they needed to refer something to the Board. We don't want to overload the Board with questions, but they do need to know where they need to draw the line and defer to the Board for review.

The compliance process, the definition. There needs to some clarification far be as nonconformances, whether or not they call nonconformances. The regs refer them to -- compliance, Monitor noncompliance. If they are issuing rather.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

certifications just based on conditions and not calling them a noncompliance. We want to make sure that there's a clear understanding as to what has to be reported to AMS compliance so that they can open the sequence of events that happens from notice of noncompliance, proposed suspension to revocation and revocation with the appeals process in there.

It's important that we receive initial reports on the noncompliances so that they can create the entire picture to make sure that the process is served. So that certified operations aren't just dismissed or decertified or revoked or suspended without having the process that's due to them.

Label evaluations will be touched on briefly.

And then we're getting ready for the first round of reaccreditation. Those announcements will start going out in April of 2006 to give them a year's notice. So we're going to tell them how that process is going to work. It's going to be just pretty much a repeat of what they did last year, or the last time when they first implemented it. But we're looking for

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

little bit more information about certifier qualifications. The regs are not specific about what it takes, what the critical mass for an accredited certifier is, so we want them to tell us in terms of qualifications, experience, education, training; paint a complete picture so that the Accreditation us Committee can look at this and make sure that people are fully qualified and that they define qualifications. They're not just saying we're qualified because we say we're qualified. And we'll be working with the Board on

And we'll be working with the Board on those issues. That's one of the things that I would like to get in front of the Board for discussion, comments, maybe a recommendation. I don't know if it would cause any reg work, but something we can look at.

Bea?

MEMBER JAMES: One more question. Will the locations, dates, times, content of the training be posted on the website?

ASSOC. DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR BRADLEY: They will.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MEMBER JAMES: Okay.

ASSOC. DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR BRADLEY: Bob is working on the training syllabus right now. We're working on that together.

The dates have just been firmed up within the last week. We knew that we wanted to work with these events, but Asilomar and the Upper Midwest Conference were pretty much established. The trainings that we're looking at in Colorado and the northeast are things that we're having to design and try to key them in with other events. So as other events are identified that we can kind of catch people that are gathering up anyway, we'll tag them in with those. But, yes, we will post them on the website.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: All right. Thanks. And, Mark, I just wanted to remind you that the Board has adopted a compliance guidance document which was quite detailed. And hopefully, that will be helpful. And if it was off base, I'd certainly like the Board to be informed of that.

ASSOC. DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR BRADLEY:

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 Absolutely. 2 Well, CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay. thanks, Barbara, Arthur, Mark for your comprehensive report. 3 4 We're scheduled now to begin public 5 comments, but we also by the clock would have a break 6 coming up very soon. So I think why don't I give the 7 names of the first two people to comment once we come 8 back from break, and read the rules for now 9 commenting. And then we will try to take a break. 10 So first the rules and the names to hold 11 your interest. 12 Board policy manual we have 13 established policy for public comments. And those 14 are: 15 All persons wishing to comment must sign-16 up in advance, and that has happened. And you'll be called on in the order to 17 18 speak. If you're not present when your name is called, 19 I'll make a note of that, come back at the end of the 20 list and I'll give you one more chance. If you're not 21 present then, well then you've forfeited your

opportunity.

1	You'll be given five minutes to comment.
2	And you're asked to give your name and
3	affiliation when you begin your comments.
4	You may carry a proxy so long as that has
5	been submitted in advance. And if you do have a
6	proxy, please mention that at the beginning of your
7	comments because you can be given an additional five
8	minutes for a total of no more than 10.
9	And all persons providing comment will
10	refrain from any personal attacks or remarks that
11	otherwise impugn on the character of any individual or
12	company.
13	So with that, when we come back from a 15
14	minute break at 10:45, Joe Smiley will be first and
15	Cayce Warf on deck.
16	MEMBER CAUGHLAN: How many do we have?
17	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: There's 20 people signed
18	up for comment on
19	MEMBER CAUGHLAN: We were to have started
20	this earlier, so I was wondering.
21	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Right. We're running a
22	little late, but I think it's been time well spent.

And we will get all the Sunset comments in before we then move on to the Committee reports and actions.

So 10:45. Please be prompt.

(Whereupon, at 10:29 a.m. a recess until 10:45 a.m.)

RIDDLE: And today's public CHAIRMAN comment session, we're asking commenters to primarily focus the Sunset Review. And there have on from each of the three committees recommendations posted for about the last three weeks. helpful comments will be comments that focus on those recommendations, especially if there are substances recommended for deferral at this time that you feel should not be deferred or there's no adequate grounds, or if there are substances that have been recommended for renewal that you feel the Committee has erred and they should be deferred for further study. But this is really not a time to debate the substances that are commended for deferral. Those we'll be taking a very close look at in the coming year, in the coming months and year.

So, at any rate, if you can focus your

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

comments on the Sunset recommendations, those would be extremely helpful to the Board at this time.

And first up we have Joe Smiley. You're heading the wrong direction, Joe.

And Goldie is not in the room. Goldie is the timekeeper typically. Is she prepared. Do you know how to work that? Yes, you can test that. Okay.

Bea? Well Goldie knows.

Two quick things before you start, Joe. As I was saying, Goldie is the timekeeper and you'll have five minutes. And she will hold up a sign giving you a one minute warning. But if you don't see the sign, that's really not her problem. The time will keep ticking.

And there may be a problem, however, that some people emailed to Katherine Benham in the last day and half, and she was out of the office. So if you requested to make comments in the last day and a half by email, your name is not probably on this list. So if you've just did it here at the last minute, make sure and check and we'll get you in if that's your situation.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Okay. With that, Joe Smiley.

MR. SMILEY: Right. Well, thank you very much. Joe Smiley, Quality Assurance International.

Not Neal Young doing the well tour.

But I'd like to thank the NOSB for all their work. I'd like to especially thank the graduating class of 2006 for all of their great work. I mean, we've got a lot of work to do. We've seen it and I think that NOSB is in a good position to do that And I think that everything that's been said the last couple of years about the growing cooperation between NOP and NOSB is well founded, and we look forward to that.

When Mark was in here, I was going to congratulate him on his new job. He said that job description was more vague and less description, and we all know that's not how Mark works. So looking forward to working with Mark and getting precise about a lot of the terms that we use. Especially these days because a lot of the issues that we're now going to be faced with are going to really require precision and accuracy, consistency and clarity.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I also appreciate Jim's and Barbara's comments on the recent congressional action. I think once the blogs, the Senates the media dies down and we get the facts the table, I think that we're all going to be able to work together and move forward to do what we're here to do, which is to keep the integrity in organics and to convert U.S. agriculture to methodologies. Those are both noble aims and I think both can be accomplished. I don't think there's a dichotomy between them.

I'd like to get to the point and endorse the NOSB recommendations. It's obviously a good start, as Jim said. Using a favorite industry expression, "You've picked the low hanging fruit," which is good; the low hanging fruit has to be picked. And so that's solid. We support it.

I especially support the deferral of lecithin. I think it's one of those perfect examples of how this rule really evolves and works that lecithin shouldn't be on the list that we are seeing moving in to start to provide organic materials.

And I think we see that across the board.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

I know as a certifier we are not supposed to -- Mark's not here for my little plug. But we're not supposed to advocate one way or the other, which we don't. We're there to enforce. And let me tell you, our job is tough without clarity and consistency. We as certifiers have to make decisions all the time on what's allowed and what's not allowed, commercial availability and the Sunset. And your work really helps us do our work. And we look forward to a lot more clarity and consistency in the rule.

As you know, we've got a lot of issues coming up. Sunsetting is just the beginning. The 606 issues, all the materials issues are going to be crucial.

In working with new companies that are new to our organic that apply for certification and bring to us their IPPs, their individual product profiles, all of their list of materials it really is getting complicated. It's really getting difficult to make decisions. And, again, we're not an accredited certification agency making decisions for multimillion dollar, multinational companies with products that are

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 extremely complicated. And so for us we need the 2 support of the NOSB and the NOP and really being clear 3 so that we have consistency across the board in our 4 examination and in our acceptance or denial of the 5 materials. 6 And so I know that's the job of the NOSB. 7 I appreciate what you've done to date. 8 Mark, you missed my comments. Too bad. But 9 you love your job anyhow. 10 But we'll do what we can to make it work. 11 And we appreciate your work. But I do want 12 stress, and I know you've heard it a million times, we 13 can't just keep on waiting and waiting and waiting for some of these things. We've got to get answers. And 14 15 quite frankly, as a company, we don't really mind what 16 the answer is as long as we get an answer and we are allowed to enforce it. 17 18 So again, God speed. And hopefully we'll 19 get clarity and consistency quicker and start to 20 quicker as we go along. 21 Thanks.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay, Joe.

Kevin, question of Joe?

MEMBER O'RELL: Well, actually, it's just a point of clarification as opposed to a question.

Joe, because you brought up the lecithin issue on the deferral. And I just wanted to make sure that the public was clear on that.

When the Committee had gone into the discussion on 205.606 item that's really where we had our broad based discussion regarding lecithin. And had agreed at that time then to defer lecithin for some additional background information. Then the point was raised that on 205.605(b) on the synthetics lecithin unbleached, we had passed that or put a recommendation to pass lecithin bleach on 205.605(b). But after the discussion on 606 we went back and the Committee together motion and second put recommendation for which we were going to defer lecithin bleach on 206.605(b).

Now that's what's published in our handbook here today. It may not have gotten published; I didn't check to see if it got on the website on time for everybody to see that. But I wanted to make that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	point very clear that the recommendation for deferral
2	both on 606 and the beach lecithin on 605(b)
3	MR. SMILEY: Well, that make sense. That
4	makes sense.
5	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks, Kevin.
6	Okay. Cayce Warf and then Mark Kastal.
7	MR. WARF: Good morning. My name is Cayce,
8	two syllables.
9	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: I'm sorry.
10	MR. WARF: Thank you. Cayce Warf,
11	Director of R&D for Alcide and EcoLab. And I support
12	the approval for the NOSP Handling Committee's
13	recommendation on the Sunset Review List 205.605(a)
14	and (b).
15	Furthermore, I would like to take this
16	opportunity to comment and seek clarify relative to
17	past and future materials relative to this Sunset
18	Review process. Specifically, the category of
19	antimicrobial rinses.
20	If you look at the NOP you don't find
21	antimicrobial rinses listed there. It should be.
22	These rinses include acidified sodium chlorite, which

I will call ASC for brevity, and peracetic acid solutions, which I will call POAA.

As a preface to my comments and the request I want to place before the Committee, I want to offer a couple of background comments.

First, I think very strongly that ruling on the acceptance or nonacceptance of materials in organic processing should be guided by environmental soundness, not synthetic versus nonsynthetic. Because there are organics that are not very environmentally sound, but are approved. Conversely, there are synthetics that are really environmentally sound but not acceptable to many in the organic community.

Second, I offer this quote for the Board's "The NOP is a marketing program that consideration. offers consumers an alterative choice and is based on sustainable practices. It is neither a food safety nor health program and by law cannot supersede regulation promulgated by FDA, EPA, FSIS or APHIS or any other regulatory agencies charged with overseeing safety in food and/or in agriculture or the environment." That is a quote from Barbara Robinson in

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

a letter stamped January 4, 2003, which a copy is attached to my comments here.

I want to focus on two of the best food antimicrobial products that commercially used are right now; peracetic acid Both and also ASC. broad spectrum, oxidative compounds are strong, antimicrobials. Microbes cannot develop resistance to either of these compounds. And the reaction products of both are benign.

For peracetic acid, for example, the reaction products are acetic acid, which is vinegar and water.

Now let me take a few minutes about ASC, acidified sodium chlorite. It breaks down into citric acid and water in common table salt, all of which occur in the agri-eco system.

ASC solutions do not chlorinate

organics as does chlorine or bleach. Acidified

sodium chlorite solutions are mixed of sodium

chlorite, which is a salt and citric acid. Citric

acid, as you know, is a principal component of lemon

juice. Sodium chlorite is used in drinking water, is

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	a precursor for making cornoxide, which by way is the
2	NOP.
3	Recently one certifying agency has
4	declined to certify a processor if that processor uses
5	ASC to control salmonella incidents on organic poultry
6	carcasses. We need consistency from all USDA
7	accredited certifiers on this particular issue here.
8	I will say that ASC is not an ingredient.
9	And in my comments I've given you chapter and verse
LO	on that. It is a food contact substance, and therefore
L1	should be outside the purview of the NOP.
L2	Again, in the letter that attached that is
L3	the opinion that was voiced by Dr. Robinson in 2003.
L4	Thank you. Any questions?
L5	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Jim?
L6	MEMBER KARREMAN: So you're saying it's
L7	food safe to issue using this goal to enhance food
L8	safety?
L9	MR. WARF: Yes, it will.
20	MEMBER KARREMAN: And isn't APHIS in
21	charge of that, or Food Safety Inspection Service?
22	FSIS or APHIS?

1	MR. WARF: Oh, yes. ASC, for example, has
2	been used to treat 9 billion pounds of chicken in the
3	United States. That's a third of all the chicken in
4	the United States has been treated or is being treated
5	with sodium chlorite as for a salmonella reduction
6	intervention.
7	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: I just would like to
8	point out that peracetic acid has been petitioned and
9	recommended
10	MR. WARF: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: for addition to the
12	National List. Have you petitioned for consideration
13	of ASC?
14	MR. WARF: Three years ago we put a
15	petition in and then we got a letter from Dr. Robinson
16	that in our mind took it out of a need to put on the
17	list because it was a food contact substance. And,
18	again, that letter is attached to this. And that is
19	outside the purview of the NOP because the residues
20	are of no consequence, and therefore it's not an
21	agreement into the final product.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Yes, I understand that.

1	I don't know if you understand, though, that the
2	whole food contact substance issue is certainly
3	controversial. And the way to have clarity on use of
4	the substance is to petition. There are numerous other
5	processing aids, similar substances that have been
6	petitioned and reviewed by the Board. And gets gives
7	clarity in a public process and whether it's
8	appropriate for use in organic. So I encourage you to
9	resubmit that petition.
10	MR. WARF: All right. And I would
11	encourage the Board also to look at calling this as a
12	food contact substance that does not need the List,
13	but I understand that it would be good for the public
14	to have it on a list, one way or the other.
15	Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thank you.
17	Mark Kastel and then Emily Brown Rosen.
18	MR. ROSEN: Good morning, all. My name is
19	Mark Kastel, I'm the Senior Foreign Policy Analyst
20	with the Cornucopia Institute.
21	And dispel any nasty rumors that have been
22	going around, this life threatening injury to this ear

was not caused by a hit man in Chicago contracted with a large agra business firm. One of my buddy's hockey sticks last Friday night went in the wrong place.

At any rate, we'd first like to take this opportunity welcome the Associate to Deputy Administrator to his position. new Mark, you've treated me and other staff members at the Cornucopia Institute with courtesy and respect, and we really appreciate that. We look forward to working with you. Much luck in your new position.

And all these comments will be brief concerning materials. I want to thank the Board. This is not easy work. It's dense and there are probably more fun things to do with your volunteer time. But you've done a wonderful job I think reviewing all these materials. The only ones we're going to comment on the record concerning our livestock materials because of our areas of expertise.

First of all, we support the recommendations of the Board. Further, we wanted to comment on the therapeutic hormone treatment using oxytocin and the parasiticide Ivermectin. We think

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

it's very appropriate to defer those. We will be survey results, which submitting we're just completely, where we've interviewed the practices et.al. organic dairy marketers in the United States on a number of issues, one of them being therapeutic And there's a very large percentage of hormone use. those respondents indicating that they do not allow their producers to use oxytocin. So I think a record will show that it's not universally believed that it's necessary.

We're not on the record making that statement today. We want to review these surveys and we will submit them.

I want to take just a couple of minutes to talk, not about pasture policy, but about the process that this Board is going to engage in the next day with your Livestock Committee meeting. I want to emphasize that we really want you to take the most aggressive action that you feel which is within your purview this meeting. I want to make sure that you're aware of the fact that somewhere between 30,000 and 40,000 written comments were submitted to the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Secretary's office within the last few weeks asking:
2	(1) That this Board be allowed to address
3	as an action item the pasture document that you're
4	going to be reviewing, and that;
5	(2) Asking the Secretary to open up the
6	nomination process for this body for public comment.
7	There's a lot at stake here in the future.
8	We want to make sure that the appointees are the most
9	qualified. There's no one who has a better handle on
10	that then the folks around this table and the folks in
11	this room, and the people they represent. And we'd
12	certainly like the Secretary to have the benefit of
13	that.
14	Just in a perspective, those 30,000 to
15	40,000, there were 50 comments to HHS concerning avian
16	flu after they posted a Federal Register notice. There
17	were 2268 comments to the FDA after they posted a
18	Federal Register notice concerning the morning after
19	pill or plan B.
20	Thank you, Goldie.
21	So this is an overwhelming response from
22	consumers. There's been five years of public input.

1 The material you're going to be reviewing has all been 2 vetted by this Board and voted on by this Board. You'll notice there isn't a lot of farmers 3 4 here today, and I only know of a couple who be here to testify tomorrow. 5 So how long will we continue down 6 this road when this started, as Jim said, there was 7 one CAFO producing organic milk that it caused this 8 There eight either operating concern. are or 9 intransitional plans right now. And this spiraling out 10 of control and we really ask you to step up and be as 11 aggressive and timely in your response as possible. 12 And I thank you for this opportunity. 13 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks, Mark. 14 Hugh and then Dave. 15 MEMBER KARREMAN: A question on 16 survey you're doing for the oxytocin. Did you say 17 you're surveying the marketing processes or are you 18 surveying the actual farmers that find the --19 MR. KASTEL: Yes. Thank you, Hugh. 20 We are just completing a survey, month study of the management practices at 21 every 22 branded organic dairy product in the United States and some private labels who have chosen to participate, though the percentage of that participation is pretty low.

Our principal interest was what practices in terms of pasture their producers are utilizing, but we also interviewed them concerning replacement cattle practices. And one of the questions how they monitor their farmers if they do place restrictive prescriptions than the NOP implements. And one of the questions was concerning therapeutic hormone use as a variable in a group of about a dozen questions.

In some cases these marketers said well we just defer to NOP regulations. We don't do anything more than that. If they say, they're certified, we don't look any further. There are some that have field people and do extensive interviews and checking on their own so that if they make labeling claims; for instance if they make a claim no hormones on their label, someone else might make no milk producing hormones on their label. Then they could violating the label integrity use oxytocin. want to make sure those labels are truthful and of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	value to the consumers.
2	And we will be rating on all these issues.
3	In addition to our narrative report we will be issuing
4	a rating of every dairy brand in the United States to
5	empower consumers and wholesale buyers to make good
6	purchasing decisions based on the management practices
7	on the farm.
8	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: David and then Nancy.
9	I'd like to remind us we need to keep
10	moving.
11	MEMBER CARTER: Just a real quick
12	question. Did you include anything on this survey in
13	terms of parasiticides?
14	MR. KASTEL: No, we didn't. Sorry, Dave.
15	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Nancy?
16	MEMBER OSTIGUY: And when you publish
17	this, will you publish the questions specifically that
18	you asked?
19	MR. KASTEL: Yes, absolutely. Yes. Yes.
20	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thank you. Thank you,
21	Mark.
22	MEMBER CAUGHLAN: And when is that due?

1	MR. KASTEL: About two months ago. If I
2	wasn't here, maybe it would be out. But we really,
3	really hope that within the next 30 days it will be
4	published.
5	MEMBER CAUGHLAN: Thank you.
6	MR. KASTEL: Thank you.
7	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay. Emily Brown Rosen
8	and then Tom Harding.
9	MS. BROWN ROSEN: Hi. Good morning. My
10	name is Emily Brown Rosen. I'm a consultant. My
11	company is called Organic Research Associates. And
12	I'm also working for Pennsylvania Certified Organic as
13	their materials manager twice a month product review
14	for organic farmers.
15	I'd like to thank you for the careful
16	review of the comments that were all filed on the
17	Sunset docket. There was a lot of comments filed, and
18	it looks like that NOSB carefully look at all of them,
19	which I'm sure wasn't easy. But I do have a couple of
20	comments on some of them.
21	One was about chlorine, and I understand

from the discussion earlier that there are already --

because from reading your docket from the Handling and Livestock Committee that chlorine was mentioned there. But it sounds like you are doing a TAP review on chlorine anyway for those. Okay. So I spend a lot of time. The main part of my comment was that it needed to be done for all three. So that wasn't clear. So I will skip over that.

I do have references in here on some of the uses in livestock and handling production that should be taken into consideration. But the main problem is it's been very inconsistently applied, the chlorine annotation across the board. Certifiers are going by all different policies. So some people are allowing any amount of chlorine to be in contact with food, if the waste water is only four parts per million, some are requiring any amount used followed by a rinse in contact with the food, some have set more in between standards. So we need to figure out what is appropriate for organic and get something workable and enforceable that can be uniform.

In the crops paper you talked about deferring hydrogen peroxide because it might not be

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 essential. And new information in putting its use in 2 the environment and residue, at least as a sanitizer. Hydrogen peroxide is formed from hydrogen 3 4 and oxygen breaks it down and those are the two end 5 products. So I don't think residue is an issue. And 6 this is discussed in the TAP review on peracetic acid. 7 You might want to check into that, the references 8 there may be useful in your question answering as far 9 as uses. 10 I would say it's also used in greenhouse 11 production of the sanitizer. It's recognized by FDA 12 for pathogen reduction in sprouts that are infiltrated 13 into the water in a sprout growing situation. 14 And it may also be used in organic potato 15 production to stop sprouting. 16 So there are definitely uses and I have 17 some references on that. And I don't know if you 18 really need to defer it or not, but you can look at 19 that. 20 Then the question of off the categories for hydrated lime and hydrogen peroxide. I want to say 21 22 originally the NOSB recommendation was that

Bordeaux mixes (copper sulfate and hydrated lime) would be allowed as a fungicide. And that was back in 1995. When the rule got published, the Bordeaux mix is not on the list but copper sulfate and hydrates lime are separate.

Copper is an off the category. Lime may be sometimes without copper. We have lime sulfur. Sulfur isn't off the category. But in general lime is a mineral, so minerals are on off the category. So I would think between being used a fungicide in combination and being mineral that it would meet the general category.

Hydrogen peroxide, I just want to remind you of your own recommendation that you adopted in August of '05 about product aids. And I know Arthur addressed this, but I think you agreed on defining aid that should also include active substances using pest control disease, weed insect and nematodes. And you stated clearly it was the intent to include other pest control options in this category because of the specific listings of sticky barriers, tree wraps and seals, insect traps, roll covers, etcetera. So I

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	think that's a very good basis for your definition,
2	and I hope you can operate on that basis of that
3	definition. Because we have a number of substitutes
4	for pest control potassium well, I guess potassium
5	bicarbonate is a mineral, but there's a number of very
6	benign materials that are much better than copper for
7	disease control. So, I think you've got an option
8	there.
9	I forgot to say I have a proxy from Leslie
10	Zook. Can we add that on? I don't expect to go over
11	too much.
12	MEMBER CAUGHLAN: I'll add it one when
13	you're through.
14	MS. BROWN ROSEN: Okay.
15	Okay. On the handling substances, again, I
16	appreciate that you're doing the TAP review. Inspector
17	Warf has mentioned this is an issue on, especially on
18	poultry rinsing.
19	I checked on the website. There were two
20	petitions filed in 2002 and it's just never been done.
21	It needs to be done and so we can clear up the
22	confusion on that issue.

In the livestock uses, chlorine is also very commonly used as a sanitizer, clean in place dairy lines. It is required at certain levels on egg washing for processing eggs that are broken for processing. So we need to look at it in context of other rules, other regulations.

And it's also implanting in a lot of TTSPPs. So it's in more places than you think.

Okay. So I just wanted to make one little comment about the docket. Coming from the docket that were due yesterday on the proposed docket. And I'm sure there were a lot of -- or I hope there were a lot of comments posted. But, you know, there's a lot of confusion over the synthetics because they were all listed only with made with organic annotations and now, obviously, that's going to be changed. Although we're not sure exactly how. But two points there.

Especially there's two materials that are on the list which I'm not in support of at least in their present form, is tetrasodium pyrophosphate and sodium acid pyrophosphate.

When I went to review the background

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

information on TAP, SAPP, there was no TAP review posted, there was no evaluation posted. In the minutes you can find records of the discussion of the supplemental TAP review but it's never been available publicly. So I think that should be deferred from the final rule until all this information can be public and we can make public comments on it.

think in light of а lot of discussion about synthetics and processing, this might be good candidate for maybe organic classification, and I'd like all to see the background information before that goes final. the same thing with TTSPP. The petition and the review criteria and I couldn't find the TAP review, and I it's all there. looked. So not It's not documented. And I think it needs more considering all the public concern about adding more synthetics at this point, these two are not well documented and we need to be really firm on this before they get out and for what category.

So, any questions?

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks, Emily.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 Tom Harding representing no proxy. 2 then John Wood on deck. 3 Tom? 4 MR. HARDING: Good morning, everyone. 5 And I do want to add my special thank you for all of you new coming Board members, the old ones 6 7 leaving. I'm sure you feel a little older now. And I certainly want to thank the NOP and 8 the staff for their good work as well. 9 10 I think we've had a lot of criticisms and 11 I think we've come a long way, and I was pretty 12 impressed with this morning. I think it's really 13 important that we continue to work together. This is our rule, not anyone else's. And that we need to work 14 15 hard at it. 16 But I really want to thank those who are leaving the Board. You've done an enormous amount of 17 18 work. 19 I do want to follow up on one thing. I 20 think synthetic and nonsynthetic issues have to be resolved as quickly as possible and not later. 21 22 an issue that I think will effect everything you're

reviewing now on the Sunset issues, and also everything that you're going to be reviewing in the future. So it's a really important issue.

Also the agriculture versus the nonagriculture issues.

Anyway, I'm here this morning. Tom Harding. I represent Agrisystems International. We work with a number of producers and coops and value added producers in this country and around the world. And we've done that for nearly 30 years.

I want to talk first of all about the issues of your recommendations. I think it's really important that we move forward your recommendation, both on the Handling from the Livestock and the Crops Committee. And I think you've done a fairly good job of looking at those things that are problematic on those lists, and that includes all of the materials list.

I do think that we need to be clear about a couple of things, and that's where I want to get into my comment next. And that is the issue of food contact substances.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

When the proposed rule came out recently, we speak of TMD 0401 or TM 0401, whichever it may be, specifically about peracetic acid. I mean that material, with a number of other materials, was petitioned on the basis with use for organic products. And the language came out for use with made with. And I understand why that took place. I think it's very important and I want to encourage you to move it back That's one issue. where it belongs. And that's for the handling side in 205.605(b).

The other issue is peracetic acid relative to livestock. I presume now from what I heard earlier, that that's going to come out in a separate proposed rule, and we'll be hearing about that soon. But I would encourage you, because it's a valuable material, it's a very benign material. It's really important that we look at under 205.603(a).

The big issue for me, though, and those minor definitions that we have in there, they're pretty clear, they were your recommendations and I supported them basically, and we do. And we have a number of letters that's already been filed on behalf

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of these materials and Crops, Livestock and Handling.

Now you remember that peracetic acid is already in two different places in crops. You've already approved it, it's already been made, it's already on the list.

I think it's really important we take materials like this and move them forward in a very productive way. But for me, anyway, it's clear that we move them back where they belong. That we recommend that they be for the use of organic and not made with organic.

The other thing that's really important, and that was the issue that was alluded to earlier, both by Dr. Warf and Emily, and that's the issue of include contact substances in general. I think it's really important that we pay fundamental attention to getting that clarity extremely clear. And I'm going to read the issue from the standpoint that it's really important to us. I work with a lot of different certifiers. And even though it's under the same rule, sometimes it's not the same results. And it's not their fault, it's our fault. We haven't clarified this issue for them. So I want to make it very clear. This is not dumping on the certifier, because they

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

have enough work to do as it is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I also want to remind that for livestock, anyway, the European Union and the UK have already approved these materials. So it's really important that we understand.

This is important to us from the standpoint of those of us who support trade that we have these kinds of materials in the trade system.

other thing is Ι want to speak specifically about the issue food Finally, and it is absolutely essential to the organic industry, especially to the USDA credited and certifiers that the NOP in conjunction with the established review, evaluation and recommendations process the NOSB provide clear, legally of а enforceable interpretation administrative and an policy that eliminates the confusion and inconsistent interpretation of the use of food contact substances in or on products labeled 100 percent organic, organic and made with organic.

We look forward to your positive and timely action on this. And I thank you for that.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

And I want to just say this: It's not about whether we should or should not petition, Jim. You made a very important point. We don't know whether we should petition or not. And I think it's really important that if we have good materials, that we move them forward. If not, we vote to send them back and we put them to asleep. But we do need clear guidance. I would say all certifiers would echo that.

And I want to thank you again for your hard work, all of you. And welcome aboard, Mark.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks, Tom.

And I do want just point out that on the issue of the annotation being added in the Federal Register notice of proposed rule for peracetic acid and those other substances, on behalf of the Board and with Andrea's input, we did submit comments to the program earlier this week consistent with that same message; the things we recommended for organic use, that that's the annotation that should appear.

MR. HARDING: Well, you're always ahead of us, and I thank you very much for that. Any other questions. Okay. Thank you very much.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks, Tom. 2 Okay. John Wood and then Tom Hutcheson. 3 WOOD: Thank you. I appreciate the MR. 4 opportunity to provide my comments to you this 5 My name is John Wood. I'm Director morning. 6 Product Registration and Compliance for EcoLab 7 Incorporated. We're based in St. Paul, Minnesota. 8 EcoLab is а leading manufacturer of industrial and institutional sanitizing cleaning and 9 10 laundry products. In that portfolio EcoLab markets 11 antimicrobially interventions which are secondary 12 direct food additives that are cleared through 21 CFR 13 173 food to reduce borne illness, pathogen surfaces 14 contamination on the of fruits and 15 vegetables, poultry, red meat and seafood. 16 As I said, these additives are classified 17 as secondary directs and they FDA's meet 18 classification as processing aid based on the Agency's 19 definition at 21 CFR 10.100(a)(3). 20 In the letter or the copy of my comments you will see that I have provided the clearances for 21

the treatment

of

peroxy acids for

22

and

red meat

poultry, the use of acidified sodium chloride solutions for the treatment of red meat, poultry, fruits and vegetables and seafood and peracetic acid solution as an intervention for our fruits and vegetables.

EcoLab supports the NOSB and the NOP to approve the NOSB Handling Committee recommendations Sunset Review List 205.605(a) and (b).

Furthermore, I would like to address this morning some of the other presenters have already touched on this, the confusion that seems to be out there as to secondary direct additives in 21 CFR by some certifiers may think that those do not meet FDA's definition of a food contact substance. As you know, NOP defines still present those ingredients regulated by the FDA as food additives permitted for direct application to food for human consumption under 21 CFR 173, except that substances that FDA has classed as food contact substances.

In 1997 through FDAMA, which amended the federal Food Drug and Cosmetic Act, FDA provided a notification process for food contact substances. And

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

a food contact substance as any substance is defined as any substance that's intended for use as a component of materials used in manufacturing, packaging, transporting or holding of food if such use is not intended to have a technical effect in the food.

This notification was intended to replace the lengthy food additive petition process. And this notification process was preserved for those additives where the agency could make a safety determination in 120 days or less. So FDA has a website, FSIS has a website now and you find on that website a list of approved food contact notifications. But the food contact notification process was not really fully implemented until the year 2000. So consequently, and as you know, we have materials, there are materials in 21 CFR 173 that meet the definition of a food contact substance. And this has led to some confusion that if a material is not on that list, then it's not a food contact substance.

I've provided to you as documentation some of the letters regarding peroxy acids and acidified

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

sodium chloride solutions, letters from USDA or FSIS stating that these are processing aids that do not have an ongoing intended technical effect and therefore, processor incidental adding labeling is not required.

So in closing, I think it's critical from what I've seen, and I've been dealing with this on a limited data. I just drawn into it recently. That there is confusion out there as to what is a food contact substance. And your help in putting forth a legal clarification to that I think would be extremely helpful to both the manufactures, the certifiers and everyone.

Thank you. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thank you, Mr. Wood.

I do have one comment. That food contact substance list, I believe, is over 540 items now at this point and it continues to grow pretty rapidly. And the statement you quoted from the NOP website just to make it clear that in the Harvey case, the USDA in their filing said that that was a draft for discussion purposes.

1	MR. WOOD: Okay.
2	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: So as the previous
3	speaker pointed out, this is a big issue. The law has
4	been changed. The program working with the Board and
5	the public really does have to sort this out. So just
6	a further background.
7	MR. WOOD: Okay. Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks.
9	Okay. We have Tom Hutcheson then Jim
10	Pierce.
11	MR. HUTCHESON: Hi. Tom Hutcheson with the
12	Organic Trade Association.
13	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Speak up, Tom.
14	MR. HUTCHESON: Sorry. I'm recovering
15	from the Greenfield Bird flu.
16	I would like to add OTA's great thanks to
17	the retiring Board members. Goldie and Dave, whose
18	not here and Jim, Rose, George; all of you have been
19	real work horses. And echoing what Jim said earlier,
20	got an incredible amount done since the final rule was
21	published. This is you've probably seen the span

of the most change that any NOSB will be see and the

contributions you've made have laid the foundation for pretty much all future work that the Board is going to do, the Board manual in particular is an extremely useful document for everyone.

Also wishing to welcome Mark Bradley into the job he loves so well. And we love having you there, Mark. It's just -- I know especially the certifiers and people working in quality verification systems will appreciate your expertise in that area.

I'd also like to endorse the recommendations in general. Obviously, a great deal of work went into them. A lot of thought, careful thought into what needed more review.

The one thing that I would suggest is that when you do defer on material, the more information about why it was deferred, the better people will be able to give comments and speed the process along so that your statement of work to the TAP reviewers can include all of the necessary parameters so that it doesn't get further hung up.

I realize there was some of which TAP reviews just weren't done, which is a very general reason. But if there were specific

reasons that came up as to why it was deferred, it would be helpful to have all of those. And some of them were. But the more information in that part of it, the better for future reference. So I guess people in general won't be around for the next Sunset Review, but you can only hope so, right?

You'll be making comments and you'll want the NOSB to include as much information as possible.

Pretty much just a heads up on a looming issue, 606. Everyone has managed to avoid a number of potential train wrecks over the last two years. I think we need to think about 606 not as major a train wreck as some of the past ones have threatened, but it is a new idea for a lot of people. Of course, the proposed rule said naturals are allowed unless they're prohibited and the preamble to the final rule said pretty much the same thing in those words.

Now we have a new situation. The process has, reading now, "Until now it's been the responsibility of certifiers and OTA expects that any new rule will mandate that manufacturers demonstrate not only that they're certifiers, but also to USDA

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

through the NOSB that a product is not commercially available in an organic form. OTA notes that this strengthens rather than weakens the existing rule."

That's supposed to be the good news.

The bad news is that OTA anticipates that upward of 1500 ingredients could be petitioned unless some degree of categorization of ingredients is allowed, in which case perhaps 50 to 100 would be petitioned, which is an order of magnitude pretty much.

longer list includes various steam distilled essential oils, Co, extracts, alcoholic extracted botanticals and derivatives of all three as well as spices. OTA would like to support the broadest categories possible that will be legally acceptable as identifying ingredients in order to mean something close to the range of organic product options, and therefore demand for raw agricultural product that the trade currently has.

Just that and a quick note that any work on smoothing a reclassification of any items from 605(b) to 605(a) if there are now natural alternatives

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

available would be helpful particularly recommendations specifically in support of the simultaneous petition to remove and approve, and any issues that may arise from that.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks, Tom.

George?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER SIEMON: Just so I understand your blocking together, there would be approval of them as a group?

MR. HUTCHESON: No.

MEMBER SIEMON: There's 1500 individual ingredients and if you break them down to 50 or 100 groups. I didn't understand.

MR. HUTCHESON: No, no. It's 50 or 100 items if you included, say, flavors that were made by a particular process that the only difference is the natural flavor rather than that you would say natural that include flavors using this process this particular one item in each of these things that's different. That is, if something -- if one flavor was flavor except for the same another as one was raspberry and one was blueberry, then you could say

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

raspberry and blueberry and whatever that were made by this process. And that might help lessen that sort of thing. Because a lot of these are, if not standard formulations, at least similar. And I don't know the technical details of that, but it's one way to start thinking about some of what's actually out there.

We have a task force going on it. These are some of the issues we've begun to identify. This is just a heads up that this may be bigger than anybody expected, that's all.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Yes. Thanks for that.

And once again, we have to keep moving. But Andrea?

MEMBER CAROE: Well, I just wanted to ask you a quick question about categories of things between 606 like spices. My concern, and I'm talking of other members of the Board, is that by doing that spices that could become available won't. There's not going to be incentive to get those products on the market because they're lumped into a broader category. So if you put spices on the list because organic saffron is not available or organic cumin and maybe a couple of other things, but organic pepper is widely

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

available, now it's on the list and processors won't have to purchase the maybe more expensive organic black pepper instead of conventional.

The worry is by listing these things that we'll lose the incentive for producers to start making these organic products, these minor ingredients available. And has your task force worked on that at all and thought about that issue?

MR. **HUTCHESON:** Well, the common understanding before materials had to be listed individually on 606 was that when they become commercially available, the manufacturers had to use them. And I think that's a separate question of how commercial availability is treated. And, again, the Board's work on this is great, let's hope it moves forward expeditiously.

So the situation really isn't any worse than it was to begin with when all naturals were allowed unless there organic alternative was an available. Obviously, keeping а list of certifiers are letting be used as not available in an organic form would be useful. So that you know a

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 posting, as I know NOSB is considering, for 30 days to 2 have anyone say wait a minute you shouldn't accept that because it is commercially available or here's 3 4 what is commercially available, are they really asking 5 for something different from that. 6 So it's certainly not any worse than it 7 And the degree of categorization is what we're was. 8 asking some consideration of. And, of course, you're 9 free to exempt anything from that within those that if 10 you think, oh you know, forget it. Pepper is never 11 going to be not available as organic, let's exempt 12 from this category, that's another route you 13 could go as well. 14 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks. Thanks, Tom, and 15 I do just want to give a reminder that we won't be 16 acting on commercial availability at this meeting. 17 It's good information, but we will be acting on the 18 Sunset recommendations. So as I ask commenters to 19 focus on those as much as possible. 20 Thanks, Tom. 21 MR. HUTCHESON: Just a heads up.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE:

22

Yes. That's no problem.

1	Always appreciate it.
2	Jim Pierce. I know Marty Mesh is not here.
3	He was next. Franz Wielemaker.
4	MR. PIERCE: Good morning, Mr. Chairman.
5	NOSB, NOP staff, ladies and gentlemen of this rather
6	snub gallery, I'm Jim Pierce self-appointed
7	certifications czar at Organic Valley Cooperative.
8	Since I missed addressing you all last
9	August, I thought it's appropriate to refresh you with
LO	the company disclaimer. The cooperative that I work
L1	for includes over 700 organic family farms in 17
L2	states. The cooperative produces refrigerated dairy
L3	products, eggs, juice, produce and meats, every bit of
L4	which is certified organic.
L5	Among the goals of the cooperative is to
L6	provide certified organic products, support family
L7	farms, promote humane treatment of farm animals,
L8	sustainable agricultural production and environmental
L9	protection.
20	Mark, I love this job.
21	The role of the NOSB as the USDA appointed
22	Advisory Committee has been debated since its

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 inception. But beyond reproach is the premise that 2 deals with materials and the NOSB works in the NOSB compliment with the NOP. As simple as that rolls off 3 4 the tongue, it's a task that has been more complex 5 than string theory. 6 Ladies and gentlemen, pat yourselves on 7 the back. This is good work well done. You are the 8 Board that first plowed through the quagmire of the 9 Sunset clause, and you're about to greet the new dawn 10 not only in tact, but as wiser seasoned veterans 11 having blazed trail for further Board members 12 follow. 13 Good job particularly of shifting through a multitude of comments, many of which missed the mark 14 15 considerable. 16 Good job remaining focused, not dealing 17 with annotations, recategorizations and other 18 temptations to meddle beyond your purview.

Good job working with the NOP on presentation and format. Good job NOP for assisting. Your guidance in accurately setting the course is obvious and appreciated.

19

20

21

Now, as I mentioned, I missed the August meeting so I've only addressed you five freshmen, soon to be sophomore members once. But veteran members know they don't get off without some criticism, always constructive and well meaning, of course. So pay attention and this won't hurt too bad, as mom used to say.

The only actual criticism I have is that a score card summary of all of this would be very helpful. Go back to the list and say which ones are going to be recategorized, which ones are going to be deferred. There's a lot of paper and I think we're going to find ourselves shuffling back and forth through a lot of paper this afternoon.

Other than that I have more questions than criticism, actually, since you really seem to be on the right track. And I hope the answers will become obvious as this meeting proceeds. Among what I hope to be enlightened on, how much of the precious time and resources available to materials review will be used? Hopefully, there will still be room for new petitions, not to mention the development of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

commercial availability criteria and subsequent reviews.

What exactly are you expecting when you refer to "further technical information?" Hopefully, it will be specific, clear and cheap, an abstract concept in Washington, D.C., I realize.

Will you be leaving too much work for the next Board? God knows their plat will be full. And I guess I just hope to come away from this meeting with the assurance that farmers and processors will not find themselves in limbo during the review of these approved materials, which previously themselves on the bubble. This is quite a list, after The list of deferred livestock materials grew all. from two to four. The processing list also grew from two to four. And the crop list grew to 15 -- 15, seven of which were added not based on comments. I'm certainly going to do my very best to keep my eyes from glazing over while you educate me on this.

I gather from the recommendations that some of these materials were not technically listed correctly, in which case they say onward organic

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

soldiers. By all means, list them all and then fix them all.

Now Jim Riddle yesterday gave me a caveat that I said I could use, so I thought I'd better use it. Address annotations for technical corrections only, not for expanding or restricting use. Is that close? Thank you.

In closing, let me close by coaching you to be conscious of the lessons learned from the Harvey lawsuit. Be careful that your decisions that you make don't cut the hands off of well meaning organic farmers and producers. Minimize the disruption at the same time as you rachet up the old organic bar. Remember that as Sunset trailblazers you are repairing past oversights and setting precedents for future Board members. Do it right, do it just and do it so you can be proud of what you've done.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks, Jim.

We have Franz and Brian Baker.

MR. WIELEMAKER: Well, it's very hard to follow this very versed speaker. I'll make it brief.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

I'm a new kid on the block in these kinds of meetings. I represent the Dole Fresh Food Company in Central is America and South America. My name Franz Wielemaker. And I'm charge of the organic program with that company. And I work with a lot of organic banana and pineapple growers in Central and South America over the last ten years.

What I would like to address is the use of ethylene in 605(b)(10). Ethylene allowed for post-harvesting ripening of tropical fruit and the degreening of citrus. And later on I'll talk about 601(k) where ethylene is mentioned for regulation of pineapple flowering.

As it is in the review committee, ethylene was deferred because further technical information had to be obtained or needs to be obtained. This is rather worrisome for a lot of the organic banana growers in Central and South America because it will give a lot of insecurity of what is going to happen in the near future. So I would like to see why or I wanted to find out why this was deferred. Because if it's about a technical information that is missing, it

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

might have been in some kind of comment that was made to NOP. And I went through the whole list of all the comments that were made. I only found one addressing ethylene. And in that comment they say that ethylene increases yields and decreases labor.

In the TAP review, for which exists, it is also said by reviewer three that ethylene would increase yield synthetically increase yield. I've seen in my 27 years of experience in banana research, I fail to see why or how ethylene applied post-harvest can increase yield. So I need a clarification for this.

And also how can it reduce labor if by all means are now able to produce an organic banana crop?

So if we can deferral changed and get ethylene for banana ripening approved this week, then I would also like to mention that I think for pineapple flowering in 601(k), I would like to add the flowering of pineapple in that section. Because just as with citrus, we do need to degreen pineapples for the market.

There exists TAP reviews for both of these

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	comments for both uses of ethylene, like mentioned.
2	These are rather recent. They're quite complete. And
3	the EPA here rules that an environmental phase studies
4	for ethylene are not required. That's a statement by
5	the EPA.
6	And also ethylene is exempt from tolerance
7	requirements because ethylene poses no dietary risk.
8	So it's beyond my comprehension at this
9	stage why ethylene should be deferred.
10	I thank you all for your attention. And
11	you're all doing a great job, and I hope I brought my
12	point across. I would like to hear some comments.
13	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks, Franz.
14	Kevin?
15	MEMBER O'RELL: Yes. And we'll go into a
16	little more detail in the presentation of the Handling
17	Committee report. But just to kind of set the
18	framework of under the gun under pressure to get as
19	much on the plate as we could, as we said the low
20	hanging fruit, which I realize you're using it for
21	fruit but I apologize. That wasn't one of the low

hanging fruit.

We chose to defer it because when we read the initial TAP review on ethylene, there were some questions there that we felt needed further review. And given the time constraints, we wanted to get through with those materials that seemed not to have a contentious position. So it's under review, we'll certainly have questions for it. And we'll make those questions known to the public as we go through the process.

MR. WIELEMAKER: The thing is by deferring it you're creating a lot of uncertainty under the growers in Central and South America. So I would say if you need clarifications on the TAP review, we can do that in the meantime. But the only negative comment that I can find in any of the two TAP reviews is by one reviewer. His comments never get reviewed. That's the end of the TAP review. So --

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Rose?

MEMBER KOENIG: I just want to make you aware of the kind of philosophy, I guess, that we took and I proposed. We had a lot of comments. We had a lot of materials that we had to review in a very short

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

period of time between the closing of the comments and when we would have to post it on the web for prior to review.

Deferral, you know I know it's not a comforting feeling for things that people depend on. But what people are assuming, and I think it's a wrong assumption, is basically we could be -- it's further technical information, some of which has already been recanted by the Board, and as Art has stated, we have some of that information back from the contractors.

You'll be involved in the process.

Anything that gets deferred will be voted upon probably at the next meeting. And some of it may not even be that much technical information. Maybe the Committee was not at the point to make a decision. So provide that information in your comment I think is really helpful. And I understand there's uncertainty.

But don't --

MR. WIELEMAKER: Do you know any of the technical issues that were at stake or that are missing.

MEMBER KOENIG: Well, we'll discuss it and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	just listen to the comments. You certainly, just like
2	this from Livestock, you know after you hear the
3	Committee's discussion as we go through those things
4	and you still have maybe a comment or so that you want
5	to provide to the Board, I don't think there's
6	anything that's stopping people from coming tomorrow
7	on issues.
8	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Only me.
9	MEMBER KOENIG: Yes. And, hopefully, if
10	we have time periods, certainly we want the Livestock
11	issue to be discussed tomorrow. But certainly if there
12	opportunity, you can always submit comments in
13	writing.
14	MR. WIELEMAKER: Okay. And then another
15	issue was the addition of degreening for pineapples in
16	601.
17	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: And it does say tropical
18	fruits already.
19	MR. WIELEMAKER: Yes. But it's in 605,
20	which is after harvest. And in pineapples it's done
21	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: In the field?
22	MR. WIELEMAKER: In the field.

1	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Yes. Yes, and I don't
2	know if you caught earlier the discussion about not
3	adding or restricting uses in the Sunset process and
4	changing annotations. So really the most appropriate
5	action there would be for you to file a petition to
6	add that as an additional approved use on that
7	particular topic.
8	MR. WIELEMAKER: Which I did.
9	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: The other I think the
10	Board is certainly hearing the need, even if we do
11	defer it for timely action, so that it's clear what
12	its regulatory status is. But it clearly is on the
13	list as approved through October 2007. No changes
14	there at all. That's the Sunset.
15	Thanks.
16	Brian Baker then Harriet Behar.
17	MR. BAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank
18	you members of the National Organic Standards Board,
19	the National Organic Program.
20	I very much appreciate all the work that
21	you've been doing, and in particular applaud the class

of 2006. But above all I want to recognize one member.

1 I'd like to respect and honor Rose Koenig for all the 2 hard work she's done on the Materials Committee. 3 (Applause). 4 MR. BAKER: Just a tremendous amount and 5 body of work that she's left. And I hope that future 6 NOSBs build that the can upon and 7 synthetic/nonsynthetic work that she to clarify and to 8 define those, not to mention her work on the Sunset 9 and to bring reason and organization to how the 10 National List is presented. 11 I'm Brian Baker, Organic Materials Review 12 Institute, Research Director. 13 MEMBER KOENIG: I thought you might have 14 been my husband or my brothers. 15 Well, they're lucky men, MR. BAKER: 16 assure you. 17 The Organic Materials Institute sees 18 Sunset as an integral part of the materials review 19 process, just as integral as the petitioning, the TAP 20 review, the NOSB recommendations, the public comment. We have to reevaluate these materials. Time does not 21 22 stand still. We have to go back to the original TAP

reviews. Having been a reviewer in those early days, I can tell you from personal experience there were things I did not know then that I know now. There were references that were not covered. There were TAP reviews that were not even done. And new information comes through every day. A lot's happened in the past week or two, not to mention what's happened over the past ten years. Science continues to make new discoveries, there's no technology.

We have seem materials that were classified as synthetic become available from organic agricultural sources. This blurs the distinction in categories between 605 and 606, to use the regulatory jargon. So the purpose of the Sunset was to not put so much of a burden on those who have taken the time to develop the new technologies, to source the organic alternatives, but to give some avenue for these things to enter into the discussion without requiring a repetition to remove.

So having said that, we also want there to be a minimum amount of disruption and a good process for those who have an economic stake on what's now on

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the list to have their voice heard and to take into account what's happening there. There needs to be a time line to remove those substances. There needs to be adequate notice for those who formulate with substances that are being removed to reformulate, or address it some other way.

We're doing our share. We've emailed all of our listed suppliers, we emailed all of our subscribing certifiers. There was a lot of confusion with that email about -- and we don't want to be sending mixed messages. So we have to refer people to the Department and to tell them to come to these meetings. Obviously, there are people who hear the word deferral and they think the word denial. They're not the same. We're not advocating the removal of any substance. We're not advocating the retention of any substance. But we do want to see some consistency in how they're addressed.

And in particular I would like to mention one category of materials that appears in both the Livestock and Processing section, nutrient vitamins and minerals. These were not properly reviewed by the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	technical advisory panel. They were given a two year
2	period for reconsideration in 1995. And there remains
3	confusion in both cases. I sent comments about that.
4	And in order for expediency, I ask you to read those
5	or ask questions if you have any at this time, rather
6	than repeat what I wrote.
7	And briefly on commercial availability, it
8	is a Sunset issue, but also a broader issue.
9	Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Brian, I just want to be
11	clear that on the nutrient and vitamin listings, you
12	are encouraging the Board to defer those at this time?
13	MR. BAKER: That is correct.
14	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay. Thanks.
15	MR. BAKER: Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: We'll have one more.
17	It's noon right now. We still have it looks like 11
18	people signed up to comment, which would be another
19	hour of comments after lunch.
20	But you're on now. And then first after
21	lunch is David Cox, then Zea Sonnabend.
22	So, Harriett?

MS. BEHAR: My name is Harriett Behar. And I live in Wisconsin. I'm a full time organic inspector, educator and enthusiastic organic consumer. My husband and I operate a certified green house, grow organic vegetables and herbs, as well as having organic processing operation an where dry we vegetables and herbs.

I want to thank the NOSB, both the outgoing members and the continuing members of this Board for their diligence and persistence in some cases in maintaining a transparent process in their review of materials allowed in organic production. I appreciate both the opportunity to comment and bring my unique perspective and experience to this process, as well as hearing the opinions and expertise of others.

There are many stakeholders in the organic community. And through open discussion and common sense compromise, the NOSB has been able to maintain organic integrity by using the OFPA criteria when making decisions. Even though at times the end of the discussion may never seem in sight, either based in

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

insufficient information or lack of agreement among the stakeholders, I encourage this Board to continue with the sometimes argues process.

In review of the Sunset documents put forth by the various NOSB Committees, I agree with these recommendations overall. I would like to see the Handling Committee review the annotation currently in place for chlorine to be further clarified to allow more than four parts per million of this synthetic to be present when the solution is in contact with the organic products. The current annotation is not clear, and in my organic experience this is inconsistently regulated.

My main comment here is also concerning annotations. While I understand that these statements in the National List are in place to limit these materials to a specific use, I see misunderstanding by both farmers and processors of the annotations when out there in the field. I have seen lidocaine and procaine be used in cattle without the complete withhold time of seven days for dairy and 90 days for slaughter. I have also seen a lot of confusion

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

concerning the annotation present on sodium nitrate with some fertilizer companies selling this product bundled into a fertilizer blend as an approved material. Both the farmer and the certification agency have difficulty in determining how much of the nitrogen in the fertilizer blend is obtained from this restricted product.

While I do not have a specific recommendation -- sorry Bea -- to change these annotations, I caution this Board to be very careful when crafting annotations to prevent confusion and abuse.

There's a variety of materials that were deferred by the various committees. And I welcome the opportunity to comment on these materials such as oxytocin, potassium chloride, streptomycin and tetracycline when these go through the transparent process of TAP reviews and NOSB debate.

Lastly, due to the recent changes by Congress of the OFPA, I would request the most recent docket put out by the NOP with the synthetic materials in the handling category listed only in the made with

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

organic category be rewritten and reopened for public comment based on the OFPA changes.

In light of this change to the OFPA, I strongly urge the NOP to work even more closely with the NOSB and public when writing the rules concerning synthetics used in and on organic products, as well as the decision making process when determining noncommercial availability. The NOSB was put in place to bring a variety opinions and expertise to the table when making these important decisions. An organic label has strong integrity and consumer trust based on the transparent and inclusive NOSB process. I urge the NOSB and the public to be vigilant in the production of our organic label as we move forward with the rulemaking based on this OFPA change.

Organic production is not a black and white process. There are many gray areas that need to be discussed in the light of day with a decision making process that recognizes organic production as a holistic system and not а linear one using the experience, wisdom and common of all sense Organic consumers, farms and processors stakeholders.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

deserve no less.

And with the methionine, just one other comment. Two meetings ago I suggested that the NOP or the NOSB put some money towards a task force to actually try to find the alternative to methionine. We now have three more years. I'd rather not just see the product keep moving forward. I would like to see an actual process to try to find the alterative.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thank you, Harriett.

Gerald?

MEMBER DAVIS: Harriett, in reference to a comment you made about sodium nitrate, there really is a simple way to, as a certifier, when it is included in a blend of blended fertilizer to document that and keep track of it in the certification, audit trail and so trail. And if you're willing to speak with me after, a break or something, I could share with you.

MS. BEHAR: Yes. As an inspector I know that I'm just saying this. It's difficult. The farmers are using it, it's being presented as an approved substance without then the farmer truly understanding

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	that they have to have this 20 percent of the nitrogen
2	needs of the plant to be proved. And when it's hidden
3	in the fertilizer, it just makes a lot of back and
4	forth with the certifier. There's just a lot of
5	extra paperwork and confusion out there.
6	MEMBER DAVIS: Well, we can talk about it
7	afterwards.
8	MS. BEHAR: Yes, I know people can
9	track it. But I'm saying practically it's not being
10	done as easily as it could be.
11	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Hugh?
12	MEMBER KARREMAN: Harriett, just a
13	question on the lidocaine. So what are you saying
14	that the annotation needs to be more published? Or
15	what are you seeing out there, first of all, because
16	I'm out there in the trenches, but you're in
17	Wisconsin. And what do you think
18	MS. BEHAR: Well, I'm in the hills and
19	you're in the trenches.
20	MEMBER KARREMAN: And what do you think it
21	should be? I mean, you know, to make it clear.
22	MS. BEHAR: Like I said, I think that

1	there's a problem that a lot of times the annotations
2	are not taken people just see the material. And for
3	some reason they don't read the rest of that sentence.
4	I just see a lot of that being a problem. So even
5	though I bring up the annotation when I'm doing the
6	inspection, I think we have to be careful about
7	annotations because they just don't seem to be taken
8	seriously as the product.
9	I see veterinarians being told that
10	lidocaine and procaine are allowed, end of sentence.
11	And so they come and they give that to the animal and
12	the farmer doesn't say, oh oh, wait a minute, oh I got
13	to pay attention to the rest. They just see it as an
14	approved material.
15	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: All right. Thanks. And
16	we'll break for lunch. Try to be back at 1:00 is what
17	the agenda says we'll start. So please be here. We'll
18	continue public comment at that time.
19	(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
20	12:07 p.m., to reconvene this same day at 1:24 p.m.)
21	

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Let's reconvene.  have most of the Board here. We still have peop waiting to comment.  Mark Castel, you just dropped some paper David Cox or is it Gary, did you want defer for now and come back later?  MR. COX: That's fine if I can get back the agenda.  CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: You'll still be on t list, but if you prefer to pass for now and that w Lynn has a plane to catch, and he had kind of fall
have most of the Board here. We still have peop waiting to comment.  Mark Castel, you just dropped some paper David Cox or is it Gary, did you want defer for now and come back later?  MR. COX: That's fine if I can get back the agenda.  CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: You'll still be on to list, but if you prefer to pass for now and that w
5 waiting to comment.  6 Mark Castel, you just dropped some paper 7 David Cox or is it Gary, did you want 8 defer for now and come back later? 9 MR. COX: That's fine if I can get back 10 the agenda. 11 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: You'll still be on t 12 list, but if you prefer to pass for now and that w
Mark Castel, you just dropped some paper  David Cox or is it Gary, did you want  defer for now and come back later?  MR. COX: That's fine if I can get back  the agenda.  CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: You'll still be on to  list, but if you prefer to pass for now and that w
David Cox or is it Gary, did you want  defer for now and come back later?  MR. COX: That's fine if I can get back  the agenda.  CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: You'll still be on to  list, but if you prefer to pass for now and that w
defer for now and come back later?  MR. COX: That's fine if I can get back the agenda.  CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: You'll still be on to
9 MR. COX: That's fine if I can get back 10 the agenda. 11 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: You'll still be on to
the agenda.  CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: You'll still be on to list, but if you prefer to pass for now and that w
CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: You'll still be on to list, but if you prefer to pass for now and that w
l2 list, but if you prefer to pass for now and that w
Lynn has a plane to catch, and he had kind of fall
off the email list, so move Lynn Clarkson up next a
then we'll fit you back in. Thanks. But then Z
will be next after Lynn.
MR. CLARKSON: Good afternoon. My name
Lynn Clarkson. I'm managing director of Clarkson S
.9 Products. We make, we process 100 percent s
lecithin. I thought it might be helpful to you

some information about availability, functionality,

those issues and expose to any questions you might have.

In your packets you will have a one and a half page presentation on availability. You've got a one pager that's more or less scientific data on the definition of what lecithin is. You have a production spec sheet on what we're offering. And you have one page of commercial propaganda or what, what we're using. You can read better than I can speak, so I will distill that page and a half.

We have been making organic lecithin for about four years. The first two years, we were writing the learning curve and falling off and then climbing back on if we learned more on how to do it. There's some trade secrets involved. We've been making world-class lecithin since January of 2004.

That lecithin is currently used in baby food in Korea, baby food in the United States, chocolate, cookies, power bars, tofu and some beverages. It is a test of functionality that we have passed and done well.

Further tests of functionality, we will be

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

happy to cooperate with any tests required by any one and we've tried to find a lecithin guru, a retired gentleman who writes the book on lecithin or if he doesn't write it, he is the editor of the book on lecithin. We would like for him to propose whatever he thinks is reasonable and submit ourselves to that.

You need to know that lecithin is not a mono product. One of the best conventional providers of lecithin has 165 standardized versions. no way that we can commercially make available right size of now with the the organic market, 165 standardized versions, so we have selected roughly three or four that have the most usage and those are available.

I want you to know that we are quite capable of making an organic bleached lecithin. We are capable of making a granulated lecithin. But at this time, we don't see enough demand to put that out commercially.

Commercial availability, we have met all offers or all requests for supply. We have surplus capacity. We have in place a plan within six months

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to double the supply and continue to increase it beyond that if there's enough demand in the marketplace. We simply don't know what's there right now.

I will tell you about one processor, one certifier that has a policy that we like. The certifier has decided we have carried the burden of persuasion meaning that we have met their standards for commercial availability and functionality that has transferred the burden to a user. If there's a user certifying a product that carries the lecithin under that seal, under that certifier, they have to show that the organic lecithin would not work for them.

We have no interest in pushing people to use something that doesn't work for them. It is a client relationship. We wish happy clients. So we like that procedure. We think that meets all of our needs.

Having said that, before I run away, I want to change hats and tell you that. I have a personal comment to make as one of the directors of the Organic Trade Association. I'm not speaking for

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

the trade association. I'm not speaking for the other directors. The Harvey and the legislative action that was taken has come up before you. I know that many of you have been keenly involved in it.

What Ι saw in the Harvey case director, with responsibility for guarding and encouraging the trade in organic materials, organic foods, in my mind a serious threat the was foundation of the industry.

The options of dealing with that were extremely limited and had some time lines. As a handler and a processor, I am typically working 18 to 24 months in the future. Other processors making food products are working sometimes 24 to 36 months in the future. I felt it was absolutely critical to address that challenge to the process sector. As I said, we were limited on our options to do so.

I supported the political legislative strategy. I wanted it to do the least disruption possible. I wanted to address the loss of the minor synthetic ingredients that had been vetted through conversations or a significant period of time.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I have absolutely no disrespect and lots of respect for the challenges to the OTA during this I am happy with the result. I think you procedure. will that the OTA is again for once open I think it wishes to embrace communication. the community and develop consensus on how we proceed and the protocols we use in the future to change things.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Kevin?

MEMBER O'RELL: Lynn, you had mentioned that some of the convention suppliers of lecithin have 165 different varieties of lecithin in the marketplace. And you concentrated on three or four versions.

Do you see any major product categories or applications that would fall through the cracks and not be able to use your product because of the road that you took to have three or four? I realize 165 is a lot of products. But is there the danger of somebody with a legitimate concern about functionality for their product, you not being able to respond?

MR. CLARKSON: I would have to say I step

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	right into my area of ignorance. There may be some
2	needs there that I'm not aware of. I cannot say that
3	we can meet everybody's needs. I can say we can meet
4	most of their needs out in the marketplace and we
5	would be happy to submit ourselves to testing for
6	anybody.
7	MEMBER O'RELL: In terms of form, you had
8	indicated you have a granule form that is available
9	now or could be available?
10	MR. CLARKSON: We have the ability to make
11	it. We have the ability to provide it and we haven't
12	seen enough demand to justify creating the supply
13	line.
14	MEMBER O'RELL: So if somebody was using a
15	dry version, but not powdered and not driving the
16	demand feasible for your production, you wouldn't be
17	able to meet that form?
18	MR. CLARKSON: We would welcome a
19	discussion with anyone and based on their needs we
20	could possibly do it. It would depend on the supply,
21	how often they needed it replenished, issues like
22	that.

MEMBER O'RELL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Rose?

MEMBER KOENIG: It has been a while. Ι actually started when the paneling committee was looking at the substance. I did a little bit of One of the reasons why we're calling for research. TAP is that it seemed like it was much complicated than what first seemed a relatively simple substance.

It seems to me from the information that I gleaned from websites is that -- I don't know, but there's a little thing that was sitting on my shoulder that was telling me those 165 types perhaps are not all natural, that there could be other substances are added to change the properties of that and that's what I was concerned with because right now the way it's listed, only the bleached form is considered synthetic.

So I was hoping with the technical information that we will obtain from our contractor to actually get a better understanding, but can you glean any information of these 165 forms, are they all just

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

-- after the extraction of it, if there were things that were added to the formulation that would change the chemisitry of the lecithin is perhaps is not a nonsynthetic.

I think we may be opening up a larger --

MR. CLARKSON: Yes, you may be and you will probably test the limits of my knowledge about that. I think you will find in some powdered versions there may be some real issues. We have learned how to make a powdered version that meets all the organic What kind of demand is there, I don't know standards. because supply and demand have to have some sort of correlation here and that's a balancing act for us, but technically we can do that even in the powdered version. But I'm not cognizant of all formulations and there are a myriad of formulations out there.

MEMBER SIEMON: Being specific about this lecithin bleach, what is your position on what we should do with that, the bleached lecithin? Is to defer it now and that's in your opinion of that? How does the supply and demand pushing for it apply? I

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	want the demand to pool the price through the
2	marketplace and you seem to be agreeable to do that.
3	MR. CLARKSON: If we had demand there, the
4	supply would be right behind it. We are capable of it
5	today. There may be formulations that we can't meet.
6	I'm quite pleased, leaving you with certifiers to
7	come to us and say is it available and then work with
8	us the way I mentioned without naming names of the
9	certifier has been.
10	I think we could meet that market
11	tomorrow, George, but I don't know the size, so I
12	don't know whether it would fit.
13	MEMBER SIEMON: But the certifier
14	methodology has really not been working, has it,
15	because some certifiers have not been?
16	MR. CLARKSON: It hasn't been working, but
17	one of the salutary issues coming from the Harvey is
18	it's sensitized people to a lot of things. It's
19	working much better.
20	(Laughter.)
21	MEMBER O'RELL: Lynn, just so you
22	understand because I know you flinched a couple of

If there were criteria given to certifiers to follow for items that were on 606, how would you feel about lecithin still remaining on 606 and having criteria come out for certifiers to follow to see if it meets going through the test of functionality? Because I think if I hear you right you're saying that if it comes off 606, there may be some specific applications that you might not be able to cover.

MR. CLARKSON: That's correct. And I don't have a right answer for this. I think I could live with either of the answers you proposed. I would like to see a general acknowledgement that is generally available, but I can tell you there are going to be some instances in which conventional may be the only thing that works.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: I just add that even when it's on 606, well, when it's on 606 that's when the certifier does that commercial availability on a case-by-case basis for every operator they certify. So that still applies.

Thanks. Go ahead.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. CLARKSON: I just want to underline that any testing that anybody wants done, we are quite happy to participate in.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay, we have Zea Sonnabend, then David Cox.

MS. SONNABEND: Hi. I'm Zea Sonnabend, representing California Certified Organic Farmers, Inc., also known sometimes as the Materials Girl, because I think I can safely say I've been around since the beginning of any materials review process for organic. And I worked for the USDA contractor, the original TAP contractor from 1994 to in preparing the original materials for 1996 Was at all the NOSB meetings at that National List. time, so it's sort of dear to my interest to comment on the sunset review, five years later.

I think the NOSB has really done a great body of work and I definitely want to thank the outgoing Members as many other people have because you've come a really long way in the ability to do the materials work that is so necessary to this Board and it's such a relief to me to not have to do it all

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

myself all the time and really keep close eyes on you for what you're doing every second.

I agree with most of the comments concerning the sunset and the renewals and deferrals, but I have a few points I want to bring out and I also want to say, in particular, that I really like the proposal to restructure the National List from August. I proposed something almost exactly the same myself in response to the first rule for restructuring it by categories.

A few other particular comments: hydrogen peroxide as Emily brought up, there are two things on there that are mistakes from the very first way the National List was set up. Hydrogen peroxide is not really a disease control, but it was put on as disease control because of the way the EPA lists the label for the products for it. It's really a crop production aid. Now it is used as a sanitizer. That's a separate use, but it's a crop production aid, very similar to a carrier because it's used with sprayed-on materials to help the plants absorb them better, an oxygenenator material.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

So this is also similar to the way lignin sulfinates are used. With micronutrients, the hydrogen peroxide can be used with micronutrients with kelp, with other things to help the plants take them up better, so I would put it as crop production aid.

Also, hydrated lime was a mistake in the

Also, hydrated lime was a mistake in the original. Emily pointed out why, but it was reviewed as part of Bordeaux mix. The annotation that was approved by the NOSB and should have been in the list was for use only with copper sulphate as part of Bordeaux mix. That did not happen and there's been no way to comment on that until now because they couldn't change the National List the way it was.

So I do recommend that you figure out a way to put it back on as copper and fix the old mistake so that it's part of Bordeaux mix.

You may wish to additionally review its uses as an insecticide because it can be used for that.

Okay, I was a little curious about the call for re-review for lignin sulfinates in antibiotics. I would like to emphasize to you that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

lignin sulfinate has many, many different uses and although it will just say chelating agent, that covers like a really large range of different types of things it can be used for.

Also, it's primarily a carrier in these things, but I really strongly in your review, to look at all the possible uses because we see this product all the time and it could actually be listed as a sulphur compound since sulphur is a key part of it, if you do restructure the list.

Antibiotics, I had a question concerning the statement in your document, the use of antibiotics and organic production for therapeutic purposes, not growth enhancements needs to be clarified. I have a very large file at home on antibiotics and on lignin sulfinates and I'm happy to offer them. I have copies of the original TAP reviews, many of which are lost from the USDA office. I'm happy to offer them.

And then we want to make sure, as growers, and I think I can safely say this for all growers. Growers want no interruption in their ability to use things and plenty of notice that something is going to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	change status. So I'm sure you all know this, but I
2	just can't it needs to be repeated time and time
3	again. Transparent review, then plenty of notice for
4	change.
5	And lastly, I have to throw in one thing
6	about the organic seed document. We liked the whole
7	thing up until the very last statement that certifiers
8	have to maintain and annually submit to NOP an up-to-
9	date list of specific nonorganic crop varieties
10	permitted for each agency. We keep this in growers'
11	files. We don't transcribe it into the computer.
12	This is hours and hours and hours of work that you're
13	asking certifiers to do extra for what purpose?
14	That's all, except spirulina, if anyone
15	wants to ask me.
16	MEMBER OSTIGUY: What about spirulina?
17	(Laughter.)
18	MS. SONNABEND: Thank you. I didn't
19	understand the point in the document concerning, it
20	said we want to renew sodium nitrate for spirulina,
21	but for use only until October 21, 2005. It's not
22	clear that because renew, it's not going to be

1	finished by October 21, 2005, so I think you need to
2	add a sentence "if this is expiring" if that's your
3	plan.
4	And I'm passing out some documents from
5	CCF Grower and his affiliated companies for you to all
6	look at.
7	MEMBER KOENIG: I'll have a look at it,
8	but I think there is a label for I think it's
9	oxidated. It wasn't a different brand name, but I
10	think that's a hydrogen peroxide.
11	MS. SONNABEND: No, it is. And the EPA
12	requires a pesticide label.
13	MEMBER KOENIG: Right.
14	MS. SONNABEND: But that's not, in effect,
15	how it's used.
16	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay, thanks. David
17	Cox.
18	MR. COX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For
19	the record, David G. Cox. I'm a lawyer with the firm
20	of Lane, Alton and Horst in Columbus, Ohio, speaking
21	today on behalf of the Cornucopia Institute.
22	In a former life, I was a Senior Assistant

the Ohio Attorney Attorney General for General's I prosecuted polluters for 14 years under the Clean Act, RCRA, CERCLA, hazardous Water waste violations. I did civil, criminal and administrative enforcement. know little bit about So Ι а and how the administrative government works regulations are promulgated, how those rules should be enforced and implemented by USDA.

And in another former life I was actually a certified organic farmer for a couple of years, raising vegetables, selling them at farmer's markets, grocery stores, restaurants and actually operated a small SCA as well. So I know a little bit about the National Organic Program. I'm familiar with the regulations and the NFPA.

There's been a lot of talk today about certifiers facing confusion over how to certify There's been talk about consistency with somebody. rules Conspicuously and the regs. absent, however, is any reference to enforcement of program.

I apologize to the Board right now. I

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

have to take my comments out of order. I believe I have permission from USDA to discuss the pasture rule because I'm not going to be here tomorrow for the meeting. But I believe I've cleared this with Mr. Neal.

With respect to the pasture rule, it's my understanding that there have been some complaints filed with USDA pertaining to a particular dairy operation out in the West that isn't complying with the -- certainly the spirit or necessarily the letter of the organic regulations as it pertains to pasture. The cows are being confined. They don't have any meaningful access to pasture. They don't freely graze actually. The calves are in hutches out there. Some of the feeder calves come from a facility that's not even certified organic. There's synthetics in the grain. It's my understanding that these complaints lodged with USDA were basically closed without any investigation being done.

So the concern I have is that USDA needs to actually institute and implement an enforcement program at the national level in order to make sure

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that this little green label that we have on all these, for instance, milk containers, actually means something.

With respect to complaints that are lodged USDA, has obligation with USDA an to actually investigate the complaint. They need to determine if there's a violation of law being conducted, if there be a violation of the law, that will occurring, or if past violations have occurred.

If that's the case, USDA needs to take appropriate enforcement action, issue administrative findings and orders, issue warning letters to the entity, actually issue cease and desist orders, notify the public of these entities, noncompliance with the laws, and engage in a process, not only with the Board, but also members of the public, with respect to the transparency of the results of the investigation. Public records need to be made available and USDA actually needs to cooperate with the Board in adopting the recommendations by the Board.

Again, my whole purpose today is to speak of some complaints that have been filed and USDA's

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

action or inaction does have some consequences. Some of these actions or inactions on the part of USDA can actually be challenged either through the Administrative Procedure Act or certain other USDA statutes that apply.

There's been a lot of work by the organic industry over the last now 15 years. It was a success to even have Congress enact the NFPA in 1990. That was -- to me, that's like on a par with Congress enacting the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, RCRA and all these environmental laws.

Now we've got some organic laws that are in place and I think it's important to actually honor the spirit and intent, not only of the statute, but also the regulations that have been adopted so that the little green label that's out there, that consumers have placed their trust in, actually means something and it's not a fictitious label.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thank you. We have Carol King, then Steven Clark. I'm sorry, I didn't give Carol a warning. Oh, you aren't signed up for

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	today. We won't make you speak then.
2	(Laughter.)
3	I'll check the list, I think it's in the
4	back of the room. Check the list, make sure you're on
5	for tomorrow.
6	Steven Clark, Diane Goodman is offering
7	comments on behalf of and Gaye Timmons, but Gaye isn't
8	here.
9	MS. KING: That was the letter I passed
10	out.
11	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: But it wasn't a proxy,
12	you could have kept going on.
13	(Laughter.)
14	Then David Hilts will be next after Diane
15	and Steven.
16	MS. GOODMAN: On behalf of myself and I'm
17	Diane Goodman for the record. I'm a consultant to the
18	organic industry and I want to express my deep
19	appreciation and gratitude to every one of you through
20	the last few months and especially to those of you who
21	are leaving, to Goldie and Dave and Jim and Rose and
22	George for the years that you have spent in this

process because I have been with you the whole time and know how much it's taken. So it's really with deep appreciation for your work.

On behalf of Steven Clark, Steven is PHD Director of Research and Industrial Development for Florida Crystals Food Corporation and this is now Steven speaking.

Good afternoon and thank you for the opportunity to make this comment. Florida Crystals recognizes the huge commitment of time and effort the Board has made to make the process of the sunset review efficient, comprehensive and accurate and we appreciate your work.

We agree with the Committee recommendations for determination of review for substances currently on the National List, is posted for comment, and urge you to vote your support, vote to support your Committee recommendations.

We continue to rely on substances in National List Sections 205.605(a) and (b), particularly enzymes, ascorbic acid, calcium hydroxide and calcium dioxide for the production of organic

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

sugar and rice and trust that your vote will guarantee those substances will remain viable after the sunset of the list.

We would also like to urge you to make your continued work with National Organic Program to clarify the definitions of synthetic and nonsynthetic, a priority in the work plans. We strongly recommend that together the Board and the NOP staff seek both scientific expertise and legal interpretation of OFPA for the most objective, compelling and valid definition that is scientifically substantiated.

I offer you, meaning Steven, offers you his expertise and knowledge about this subject and invite you to call on him to assist you in any way that he can.

We also support the Board in its upcoming role, advising NOP as rulemaking is developed to follow recently legislative action to create an expedited petition process for substances not available commercially, excuse me, not commercially available organically.

As a related note, we have many customers

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

who use products that will now need to be included in 7 CFR 205.606, based on the Federal Register notice of July 1st which limits those nonorganic agricultural substances to the five currently listed. We suggest work collaboratively with trade the Board your association which has a task force already in place, working on questions, considerations and criteria as well members of the industry to best as certifiers determine commercial availability and help producers and handlers comply with new regulatory interpretation and rulemaking.

Florida Crystals would also like to take this opportunity to recognize Jim, Dave, George, Goldie and Rose for their years of dedication and service to the Board, to the organic industry and we wish you all well in your future endeavors. Thank you for your time and consideration of our cause.

Questions?

MEMBER DAVIS: Thanks, Diane. David Hilts and then we'll have Tom Harding speaking on behalf of Dennis Stiffler.

David?

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. HILTS: Good afternoon, everybody. Thanks again, I want to thank the NOP and the NOSB for their continued hard work in this area and also providing the opportunity for public comment into the decisions for organic agriculture.

My name is Dave Hilts. I'm a research scientist, a biochemist with Acadian Seaplants which one of the world's largest manufacturers of aquatic plant extracts. We're located in Nova Scotia, Canada, the east coast of Canada. And I'm here today just to provide some public comment on the on-going sunset specifically, the decision on the Materials review, defer Review Committee to recommendation the renewal of aquatic plant extracts as thev are currently outlined in 205.601(j) on the National List, until technical information is obtained.

Acadian Seaplants has supplied aquatic plant extracts to organic growers for the past 15 years and we hope to continue to supply aquatic plant extracts beyond 2007 as the benefits of using our products in agriculture have been well documented over the last 40 years, both from our products and aquatic

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

plant extracts that are produced by a variety of companies around the world.

Our products, just for some background, are produced from freshly harvested marine algae and we do use an alkaline extraction process, that is we add a small amount of potassium hydroxide during the extraction to help rupture the cell walls of the algae and thus allowing the beneficial compounds like plant growth hormones, organic acids, carbohydrates, micronutrients, etcetera, to be released into the liquid phase. We then remove cellular debris and are left with a 100 percent, water soluble marine plant extract.

There have been some comments or some questions from some in the organic community that manufacturers of aquatic plant extracts like Acadian Seaplants could potentially add excess alkali to our products to fortify it with potassium. And I can't speak for the entire industry, but certainly in our company's situation that is not the case.

We use only a minimum amount required to produce a quality extract and our recipe that we use

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

for the extraction process was developed in conjunction with the National Research Council of Canada and is very sensitive to the actual amount of alkali that we do add. If we add excess or minimum -little alkali, it leads excess or too major manufacturing problems for us. It leads to major stability problems with the product. So that's something we certainly don't have advocate and we can't do.

There's also been some question that we may have petitioned the National Organic Program for the use of phosphoric acid as a pH adjuster as simply a way to fortify our products and synthetic phosphorous. And again, that's not the case. Our product is a complex, organic mixture when it's done, as I mentioned earlier, and it is susceptible to microbial spoilage with bacteria and molds which will then degrade the product.

And prior to the final rule being implemented in 2002, we used a synthetic preservative which was found in the U.S. EPA's Inerts List which is a list for inert, but once the final rule came into

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

effect, we were no longer permitted to do that. And rather than petition the NOP for the use of that synthetic preservative, we looked at the current regulations that were in effect for other products in our group and simply asked that the same annotation that was extended to another biological mixture in the category, namely the liquid fish products, be allowed to us as well, that is, using pH adjustment to stabilize the product.

We tried using citric acid which is one of the organic acids that was listed under the annotation and in our product, we simply cannot achieve the pH required to stabilize the product which is down below 4, using citric acid. That left only phosphoric and sulfuric and phosphoric was the choice that we pushed for, simply because it's triprotic acid which means you use the minimum of that.

One other issue, even if -- the use of potassium hydroxide and phosphoric acid in aquatic plant extracts, it just doesn't lead to agronomically significant quantities of these macronutrients in the final products. Given our application guidelines and

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

the NPK analysis for aquatic plant extracts, much less than 1 percent of the required nutrient requirements for our crop in any given year could be used, or could be supplied by applying our product.

And there's no way, both from an economic fact and from the fact that the residual salt that comes out the aquatic plant in our product, there's no way you could over-apply a product. A producer could not use our product at a thousand times the application guideline and try to reap these things.

If the current annotation is not renewed, that would leave only hydrolyzed extracts under the definition that's currently in there and the NOSB under my understanding has interpreted this to mean only reactions with water, and therefore you'd only have a water-algal suspension that would be available out there for producers' use. And we have a pretty good market penetration and I'm not aware of any simple mixtures of just algae and water that are out there and primarily I would suspect we would come back to still being the fact that there are no -- there's no way to stabilize that product.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	So just in closing, we request the
2	National Organics Standard Board and the NOP to
3	continue to work together to find a path by which
4	aquatic plant extracts containing minor levels of
5	synthetic processing aids remain a viable source for
6	growers in organic markets and certainly if Acadian
7	Seaplants can provide any information, technical
8	information, we'd be more than happy to do so.
9	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks, Dave. George?
10	MEMBER SIEMON: The one percent was of
11	what mineral?
12	MR. HILTS: Sodium.
13	MEMBER SIEMON: The one percent
14	MR. HILTS: It would be the potassium
15	phosphorous that we would be adding and if you look at
16	the actual analysis of our product and look at the
17	proper requirement for those things, the application
18	outline, it would be one percent.
19	Thank you all for your time.
20	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay, we have Tom
21	Harding speaking on behalf of Dennis Stiffler. And
22	then Kim Dietz. I don't think Kim is she hi,

1	Kim. Sorry, didn't see you back there.
2	Okay, Tom, again.
3	MR. HARDING: Thanks, Jim. Good
4	afternoon. I'm Tom Harding speaking on behalf of Dr.
5	Dennis Stiffler.
6	And Dennis is the Executive Vice President
7	of Food Safety for Coleman Natural Foods and NBC
8	Natural Foods.
9	It's along the same subjects that we've
10	talked about, but first of all I wanted to mention
11	that Coleman is in support of the work of the NOSB and
12	the recommendations that have come forward with
13	regards to materials, by and large, and certainly in
14	principle. And certainly encourages that measure to
15	go forward under the sunset review process.
16	As a brief matter of introduction, we all
17	know that Coleman has been around, one of the pioneers
18	in this business. And I'll just give you some
19	background real quickly.
20	Coleman Natural Foods represents a
21	collection of premiere entrepreneurial founding
22	companies, natural in scope, specializing in the

raising, the growing of natural and organic protein products, all of them in the organic category that are certified under the NOP.

Livestock systems include fully integrated production systems, poultry to pre-approved ranch and farm source verification; pork, lamb, bison and affidavit documentation support.

The majority of the harvesting and processing of the poultry, fresh prepared foods and controlled company owned are handled in controlled company owned facilities.

Outsource harvesting and processing is conducted for pork, lamb, bison, and fully-cooked prepared foods.

The marketing brands, just to mention a few, the Coleman Purely Natural, the Rocky Mountain Range, Rose, the Organic Chicken and then we can go on with red meat division. Again, Coleman Natural B3R. The Poultry Division, Pataluma Poultry Processors, certified entity as well, and the Prepared Foods Division.

The purpose of this testimony and public

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

comment is to address the use of oxidated antimicrobial decontamination interventions to control pathogens in red meat, poultry and prepared foods and to ensure consumers of the most food safe products possible.

The prospective: the general consumer associates organic food products with health, wellness and quality and of course, food safety. Producers and the processors of organic products are vigilant their efforts to produce crops and raise animals and process products to deliver quality and food safe products to ensure consumers of the safest product possible using processing aids and food substances that do not change the very nature of the product that result in residues, and are compliant of with the values organic production: core enhancement of the environment, reducing the amount of chemicals and sustainable practices and methods. that does not fundamentally change the definition of the organic food or for that matter, the finished product.

The potential pathogens are there and

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

consumers know that and they expect us to rid the product of pathogens.

These pathogens are ubiquitous in the environment. They are found in the fruits, the vegetables, the water, the meat and meat products and in fact, almost everything we eat.

The research data -- I'm not going to go into it because it's endless and fairly well substantiated and I just want to say that Coleman is a valuable resource. I hope that you will turn to them as we start to consider these other issues and I'm going to get right into the recommendations and the summary.

Oxidative antimicrobial decontamination products that are consistent with FDA's definition of secondary direct food contact additives, 21 CFR 173.325, and considered either а food contact substance of a processing aid, 21 CFR 101.100(a) and (3) thus not subject to labeling, should be readily available to organic food processors.

I want to insert something here because I've already heard it and I want to be very clear. No

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

one and Jim raised that point and we appreciated it, no one is asking for the whole list to be approved. We're talking about the very specific, targeted expectations of materials. We're first of all not that crazy and secondly, it's an impossible task. So I want to be very clear about that.

It's really important that we look at it in the broader sense. There are only a momentary technical effect on the treatment, but not lasting functional effect and there is a low probability of any significant residue on the finished product.

NOP regulations suggest that all nonorganic substances including processing aids are to be included in the National List, 7 CFR 205.105(c).

USDA has stated that these substances do not need to undergo the normal review and submission of material by manufacturers, other than ingredients, additives need to under January 2003 letter and we cite Dr. Robinson again.

Inconsistencies do exist in the interpretation in the approval of processing agents through contacts, substances among certain third party

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	certifying agents. And that point there is that there
2	is an inconsistency and it does not follow the
3	certifier and we need to correct that problem because
4	of the lack of clarity on this issue.
5	Summary: consumers should come first and
6	be protected, not exposed or do an interpretation of a
7	technical matter that is not clear that affects food
8	safety, ultimately accepting and rejecting an organic
9	product will come from consumers. Oxidated
10	antimicrobials that do not resolve in product
11	technical effect and greatly enhance the food safety
12	of the organic products should be allowed and used.
13	And the matter needs to be clarified and I thank you
14	very much.
15	MEMBER KOENIG: A technical question, and
16	you might be able to clarify it. It's a question of
17	ignorance, I think.
18	So there is a distinction between that and
19	a preservative. So you're saying preservatives have
20	an attainable effect. These have a there's a
21	MR. HARDING: Momentary.

MEMBER KOENIG: There's a momentary --

1	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Does it extend the shelf
2	life?
3	MR. HARDING: It doesn't extend shelf
4	life. What it does it extends food safety and I won't
5	get into the shelf life discussion because I'm not the
6	person to answer that question. It's a point.
7	MEMBER KOENIG: It's it a fine
8	distinction? It is a defined distinction that we can
9	access somehow? I look at those and say preservative
10	preservatives have the same microbial but
11	what you're saying is first, it's rinsed, it kills,
12	but it doesn't stay in a functional effect in the
13	product.
14	MR. HARDING: And we would be challenged
15	to find that on the surface, after treated and
16	properly handled. And we're talking about water and
17	vinegar, technical speaking, and most of these
18	materials are sodium chloride.
19	MEMBER KOENIG: And just a clarification,
20	ozone is on our list. What is it used for? Is it
21	similar?
22	MR. HARDING: Thank you for that question.

1	No, we're not talking about ozone.
2	MEMBER KOENIG: As far as I know, ozone is
3	sort of that same function and I mean it's there. I'm
4	not sure who petitioned, when it was petitioned.
5	Maybe we can ask Zea. Zea may be able to help us with
6	that.
7	MS. SONNABEND: Ozone is used more as an
8	alternative to chlorine for use in water-based systems
9	like hydro like in your hot tub. It's not used for
10	cleaning equipment or like that.
11	MR. HARDING: And we are speaking
12	specifically of periacetic acid and acidified sodium
13	chloride.
14	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks, Jim. Thank you,
15	Rose.
16	Kim Dietz is the last commenter who signed
17	up.
18	MS. DIETZ: Kim Dietz. I just want to go
19	on the record. These are my personal comments and
20	don't reflect the Smucker Company.
21	I wasn't going to say anything, but I do
22	want to say thank you to this entire Board and all the

1	outgoing Members. I've had the privilege of working
2	with you guys for the four years previous to this and
3	I know that your hearts and souls and dedication are
4	certainly to the organic industry and I appreciate
5	that. So for all of you, those are my kind words.
6	I support the <u>Federal Register</u> docket to
7	move materials to the organic label, the handling
8	materials that were recommended. This Board
9	recommended them to go into the organic label. I also
10	support that.
11	I support the Handling Committee sunset
12	recommendations. Good job, you guys. I was scared to
13	death that this day would never come and it has, so
14	you've done a great job with that.
15	I also support the deferral on flavors. I
16	believe that I was part of the Handling Committee when
17	we originally chose flavors and colors to be deferred.
18	We know it's a contentious area. It's going to be.
19	Let's just get down to it.
20	I have a couple of comments on that. I
21	suggest that when we do look at flavors, let's go back

and look at the minutes from the 1995 recommendations,

pour through those minutes -- I looked through those think there's a minutes last week. Ι lot information in there that we need to consider. And, to me, I think the biggest issue that we need to look at is commercial availability on organic flavors and natural flavors. There's a lot of people that have converted to organic. There's a lot of people that And I think that, as the Board's role, you haven't. should look at commercial availability and somehow try to put that in the mix of the decision.

I do not support any annotation changes during the sunset review. I'm not sure, I thought I heard you say that, Rose. I just wanted to make sure that -- There's a process for that. It's called the petition process. You can add or remove a material or you can recommend a change in annotations and I believe that that's the way that process should work. And, other than that, that's it.

So, good job. I look forward to five new Board Members. And I hope that all of you stay in the industry and continue your good work because we certainly need you.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks Kim. We will be having six new board members. I see Andrea, and then Kevin. Andrea?

MEMBER CAROE: Kim, really quickly. You were talking about commercial availability as it relates to flavors. Could you elaborate on that a little bit? I'm not quite sure what you were --

MS. DIETZ: Well, for example, I believe in 1995, when flavors were put on the National List, there were no organic flavors. The company that I work for was actually the first company to commission house and you see that in the We commissioned a flavor house. comments. Since then, there's a lot of organic flavors out there. Ι don't believe that companies, one, are using them the way they should. That's my personal belief. And, that they're not available to match the organic flavors are not available in the same form and function as natural flavors. So, we're not there all the way yet. We're partially there. We're probably fifty, sixty, seventy percent there. But we're not all the way there.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MEMBER CAROE: Just picking your brain,
2	though
3	MS. DIETZ: Yes.
4	MEMBER CAROE: as the expert on
5	materials here
6	(Laughter).
7	MEMBER CAROE: I'm not an expert. Now,
8	as we look at, I mean, flavors is one of those broad
9	categories and we have some that are widely-available
LO	organic and others that are not. So, logistically,
1	I'm trying to figure out I mean, we're in a sunset
L2	process here, so it's accept or reject. So, what are
L3	you thinking. Are you
L4	MS. DIETZ: I think you need to, I mean,
L5	you need to seek industry input. I think you need to
L6	find out what people are using. Why they're not using
L7	organic. They're supposed to be, I would think that
L8	if they're available, companies should be using them,
L9	although they don't have to because they're on the
20	National List. So, that's an issue.
21	I don't know what the recommendation
2	logistically you know I believe they need to stay

1	on, because you don't have organics in all functions
2	and forms yet. I hope there's a day that they can
3	come off. We're just not quite there with technology.
4	MEMBER O'RELL: Thanks for your comments,
5	Kim. And my comment was kind of along the lines of
6	what Andrea said. It really relates to the commercial
7	availability and I think we all share your concerns.
8	But, knowing that the sunset process is not the
9	process that we deal with commercial availability of
10	these items. We have to make the determination as you
11	know, whether they stay on the list or off the list.
12	But, certainly, we share your concerns on
13	MS. DIETZ: Right, but, you know, I mean
14	ideally somebody should petition to change the
15	annotation and add something in there that you must
16	use organic flavors when available. And I don't know
17	how to go about that. We've never tackled that beast
18	yet, when they're both when some are available and
19	some aren't
20	MEMBER O'RELL: Right
21	MS. DIETZ: Flavors are one of those

1 and then, Rose -- yes, I see you. I do, but not when 2 I talk. 3 (Laughter.) 4 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: The question I have is, 5 natural flavors that would are there be non-6 agricultural, or are they agricultural and therefore 7 more appropriate to be moved to 606. Because that would drive that --8 9 MS. DIETZ: Yes. 10 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: -- development. 11 MS. DIETZ: Yes. I mean I think that's 12 what you're looking for in the TAP. 13 technical information that we're seeking. In my mind, 14 they're twofold. First, commercial availability and 15 really, are they, could they be moved to 606? 16 that's, as we review these, this material, or these 17 materials, that's some of the questions that we're 18 going to have to answer. 19 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Rose? 20 MEMBER KOENIG: Again, some of the things that can be deferred -- it's not necessarily event the 21

You know, one of the problems is

technical issue.

1	that and this is what popped up with lecithin
2	there's no way you can have one group that's not
3	agriculture, the other form is agricultural. It goes
4	back to that definition of non-ag and ag. So, flavors
5	are agricultural, they don't belong on 205.605 period.
6	So that, you know, we had some things that are, I
7	don't know why categorically, they were placed on the
8	list, but if there's something that's agriculture, it
9	can't be
10	MS. DIETZ: Right, and I don't know if
11	this Board can move things. Again, it's the petition
12	process. We should have repetitioned or done
13	something with flavors before this point, before you
14	have to add or remove
15	MEMBER KOENIG: Well
16	MS. DIETZ: or maybe that's something
17	that's going to come up
18	MEMBER KOENIG: hopefully, Arthur will
19	be here to discuss. We may not be able to come to the
20	conclusion on these, and we don't necessarily have to.
21	Things that have been deferred, we're not even voting
22	on.

1	But we need to get that discussion started
2	so that you know during the next meeting what our
3	process is going to e.
4	MS. DIETZ: And I know, I think this will
5	be the hottest issue and the sunset is in 2007 and you
6	have a whole industry relying on flavors right now, so
7	that's why I'm encouraging you to act as fast as you
8	can, start seeking the input that you need on
9	commercial availability and whether they're natural or
10	it should be on 605 or 606. And then make those
11	recommendations fast.
12	As fast as possible. We don't want 2007
13	to roll around.
14	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thank all of the
15	commenters today. It's been some very valuable
16	information. Thanks for taking for your time and
17	coming before the Board.
18	Okay, we're going to go then to Rose,
19	right, with an overview of the sunset review process.
20	Kind of where we got to where we are today.
21	MEMBER KOENIG: And for the sake of time
22	I'm just going to verbally go through it and then I

guess if any Board Members has specific questions, you all have been through this, so you all have been through the process.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: And there is not a handout in our book.

MEMBER KOENIG: The first thing I would like to do is thank all the commenters who came out because if we did not have material to work with, we would have been in trouble.

We had some comments. Those we had to deal with the best we could, but there were many thoughtful comments, very specific to the best of people's ability. They gave us some information that we could really think about and I will tell you that the Committees did read each and every comment. I read all the comments as well as the chairs of the Committees and the Committees Members, for those groups.

Some individual members may be relying on the recommendations of committees, but it has -- those comments have been viewed by multiple members, especially when they were voting on the recommendation

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

at the committee level.

Basically, we proposed a working document for sunset -- I can't remember if Kim or I was chair at that time. That's how long it seems like it's been that we've been talking about those procedures.

The NOP had a <u>Federal Register</u> notice that went out that explained this process and what was required based on comments and what really sunset was intended to mean in terms or what our jobs and obligations were as a Board.

And it was correctly stated that we are -- as a sunset procedure, we're either voting things to continue as they exist on the list of they discontinue. That is what sunset is. There's no changing. That's part of that process in terms of annotation.

But I would like to discuss and we'll talk about this after I've gone through this brief overview are the other options that we can do outside of the sunset process, but clearly sunset and what you're going to see here is either we're accepting the materials and their present annotation or we're

rejecting them and that means in 2007, they would not be renewed, but things are status quo until that time.

Do not get delisted after this meeting. It's until the end of 2007.

that proposed based upon working documents, the naive notions of Ι guess to our committee, we have thought that there would be this great database that was going to be organized and things would be categorized and there would be a lot of forward work that could be accomplished. unfortunately there was one due date for all the comments and then we have this meeting scheduled a few months down the road, but we have to have our comments out to the public a month prior to the meeting.

So we essentially had about 8 weeks or 10 weeks go to through all those comments.

So the approach we took as many folks have noticed is kind of doing the easiest groups first. Easiest in the sense that there were just positive that we need this. There was no indication from any of the commenters that it was no longer needed or there was any kind of inconsistencies with the OFPA

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

criteria.

And those, the great body of the recommendations that we're making today that we'll be reviewing are those, in fact, those materials. I asked Arthur earlier, there's about 167 materials that were put forth in the <u>Federal Register</u> notice that have come forth during this process.

A number of them, however, are in multiple different use categories so it's not 167 different substances, but if you base them on categorical use, that's how it's reflected.

So you'll see, you know, chlorine materials on livestock and crops and handling, although you know, in terms of maybe a deferral or review, you only have to kind of do one technical review for those multiple uses.

But -- so we have quite a large slate of materials that we're going to go through and hopefully it wont' look like we're just kind of rubber stamping these materials. What we did is after we received all those comments, Arthur gave a hired copy and mailed them to myself as chair of the Materials Committee and

each of the chairs of the Committee received hard copies so that would facilitate their work in terms of organizing their Committees.

And then additionally, every Committee Member had access to the web so that they could review the comments from all the individual commenters and the public, also could review those, as you prepared for the meeting.

Our first initial Committee meetings kind of set of the procedures. We asked the NOP, there was good collaborative relationship trying to determine how to proceed, what information does the NOP need from the Committees in terms of eventually writing a Federal Register notice for these materials.

And basically, based on that feedback and the back and forth between the various Committees, we came up with a format that was used with the livestock and crops committees specifically because of the use categories and all of those lists. So we decided to kind of break the lists apart and have separate recommendations for each category and you'll see as we go through the process that's how we're going to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

handle materials.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And then the Handling Committee just kind of had a slight -- same kind of format, just a slight variation of that because it's just one kind of master list.

So the one thing that I'd like to also state is that as the Committees and most Committees three different conference calls two to materials, where the discussed the materials actually took votes, there was a great effort to make sure that people did not have conflicts of interest and it was asked of Committee members to state if there was any conflict of interest and then the Committee voted to determine whether they felt that this person should or should not vote. And we'll be following that procedure today. I want Committee members to disclose if they do have any kind of conflict of interest, either the company has provided a public comment, let the rest of the Board determine whether that individual should vote or not vote on those materials.

And I think that's basically my comments,

Jim.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks, Rose. Thanks for reading through all those comments and then screening the drafts from all the Committees and continuing to give comments. Rose?

**MEMBER** KOENIG: That the was sunset procedure. The question that I have for NOP and they can think on and we can think on as far as these deferred materials, as I stated, that some things were pulled because of inconsistency with often the sense that there isn't truly a category, especially in crops particular specifically is outlined for That might have kind of caused the materials. deferral. Certainly comments provided by the public triggered deferrals and you can see some of reasoning in the documents, why there were deferrals.

As I stated, we know that sunset is not the opportunity to change annotations, but many of the substances that have been deferred have issues that could involve annotations or could involve that it's not just on the list where it should be. In other words, it's going to change.

So the question that I would like to pose and again, it's not going to impact the materials now, but one idea is that we would vote yea or nay in terms of the continuance, but if there are materials that we have received technical evaluations on because we're getting technical -- we're using our TAP contractors similarly to the way we use them somebody petitions something.

If we can, in a separate process, as we evaluate these substances and relist them, so that when say we vote on them in March, if that's when a meeting is, they would be going through a separate <a href="#">Federal Register</a> notice as a new listing, a proper listing, a corrected listing and we would at the same time, as we submit our sunset document, those would be ones that would not be furthered after 207.

So what we're hoping could happen would be that it would be a simultaneous adding and actually kind of taking off of the list something, but through two separate processes.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: I don't know if that -
f everyone understood or followed that, but my

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

understanding, I'll just try and paraphrase it and then take comments, would be that if we find through the additional review that a deferred material, something that would be deferred today, we wouldn't be making any of these decisions now, if they could be deferred today, but then the review occurs and it's found that the annotation really is inappropriate.

We can't correct the annotation in the sunset process, so instead, that listing would expire. It would truly sunset. But because we got a new review, a new TAP, we have the information to make a recommendation that there be essentially a new listing be added to replace the one that expires. So there's continuity there. Producers aren't left in the lurch, but that's a plan and I think Arthur is still checking to see if that is really a workable approach to this.

Andrea, then Julie.

MEMBER CAROE: I would propose a different procedure and I would propose that we do the yea or nay vote on these materials and if they are material that may need an annotation change, that we vote to keep it on and allow the petition process to happen

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

afterwards to change that.

However, we've posted these as if -- after this recommendation tomorrow happens, we'll have posted what materials are deferred. We can accept petitions and as these are sent to TAP reviewers, let them know that there is a petition for these to be added in some other form. The TAP reviewer could do double work at that time.

But I still think we need a yea or nay vote on it and if it is something that we feel may need a change, I would propose that we vote to allow it to stay on the list and deal with the changes afterwards so that inaction on the second step of that would keep it on the list and keep it in the hands of growers because if it does — if we try to do the switch over and something happens with that second step, it's off the list and I think that's dangerous. I'd rather keep it on and work the change afterwards.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: We aren't going to decide this today.

MEMBER KOENIG: And I agree, if we can't get guarantees that that it couldn't happen

simultaneous.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: So I think that's another good idea to consider, another structure.

Julie?

MEMBER WEISMAN: I have a procedural question in regard to this and I ask for your patience because I'm still in my learning curve.

Who is initiating that petition? Everything that I've been exposed to up until now, petitions have been initiated by folks out there. And that's the question that I was posing to Arthur.

MEMBER KOENIG: The NOSB certainly has the authority to have the national list, okay? normal cases, things that are brought forth are sort of the mechanism of a petition is out there so that public this. the hey, need And can say we essentially, we take that petition and do a technical Our vote is based on that technical review. It's -- we don't necessarily -- the reviewer may glean information from the petition, but basically we look at the TAP and sometimes we do look at the petition to augment that information.

And that's the question I had procedurally myself to Arthur. Essentially, it's not that we're pulling something out. We're going to have technical information, we would fill out the same sheets and have to go through the same procedure and look at the same criteria. It's just -- it's true, it would be a process where the call is initiating from the Board, rather than -- so that's -- so those are some of the issues that have to be discussed.

Can I state one more comment? The only thing that disturbs me with the concept and I know for facilitating things and I'm willing -- I'm certainly a compromiser, but you're going to have to convince me. I think in the spirit of the sunset procedure, if we knowingly are aware of a problem, and we just sort of ignore it by saying okay, well, let's automatically renew it even though we know some things, then what the heck is sunset all about if we're going to just rubber stamp practically everything? That's just -- I just put that out there.

MEMBER CAROE: Just a response to that. If we know there's a problem with material, we don't

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

renew it, period. We don't renew a material if there's a problem with it.

If the annotation isn't exactly the way we want it or the community wants it -- there's a petition process for that, Rose. I mean we need to be very receptive to that and pay attention to those petitions as they come in, like any other petition. I mean there may be materials that aren't up for sunset would be the same thing.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Arthur and then Bea.

MR. NEAL: I'll be quick. We agreed upon early in the process no change in annotations. And with this particular process, what we have we've got substances that have been on the list for five years and people had five years to petition. Now we get to sunset and we want to do it through the Board which complicates everything because we've got other people in the audience that want to have annotations modified as well.

So you've got the question is will the Board entertain those requests too? So either we keep it on or we take it off. That's what sunset is about.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

The continued use of a prohibition or allow a substance.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Bea and then Goldie.

MEMBER JAMES: I just was going to make comment about adding in another process at this stage in the game, especially with the consideration that we're going through a big transition here on the Board and that to leave behind a new process it's just -- I just feel like we need to make the votes today on the items and then if we have a new process that we want to implement, that we need to formulate that before we just go ahead and say okay, we're going to do this on these items. Because I don't feel comfortable knowing that you're not going to be here next time and there's this new process that we're trying to implement.

MEMBER KOENIG: And again, it's not -what we're discussing here is not -- the sunset procedure is the sunset procedure. I'm not saying that we're changing that. I think we're all on the same table. Nothing can change annotation-wise. We're either keeping what we have removing or something that -- you know.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

What I'm saying is that and it's not on the materials that I think that we're dealing with today, so we're trying to be proactive of what's coming up. I'm saying that there may be things that the Board just cannot live with in terms of — then they take it off. But I'm saying if we have the technical information in hand, we have TAP reports. We just spent X amount of dollars from our contractor, if we have the technical information and we want to reconsider it, can we at that time reconsider it, not for sunset, but as adding something to the list.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Arthur or Barbara?

MS. ROBINSON: I strongly recommend that you keep the sunset process as clean as possible. The more you complicate this thing, the worse it's going to get. I mean Bea is making a good point, but that point is valid whether Members are going on and off the Board regardless. But you know, the more things that you say well, maybe this is an opportune time to reconsider this or that is just going to make this thing grow exponentially and get more and more complicated and you will -- trust me on this. When we

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

have tried to say well, while we're at it why don't we do this, it opens doors and --

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

You wouldn't believe what starts falling through the doors. In fact, you know what happens when we do that.

petition process is on-going an process that exists all the time. It is open to anybody all the time. And as we've had this discussion for Ι don't know how many years, annotations have been a problem all the time.

So in one respect, we could all say well, maybe this is the time to learn now that careful annotations are probably better. This is a good time to take advantage of hindsight and say let's careful how we annotate in the future. But if you feel that strongly that something is so badlv annotated or the information that you're now getting from a review says we don't like this material, I really -- take it off, you know?

If an annotation alone can correct the way it's being used, why do you feel that badly about it?

Keep sunset simple. It is a complicated enough process as it is. Annotation should not be the trap door by which you either put a material on this list or take it off. The petition process is for that.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks, Barbara. And I anticipate that once some of these deferred materials come back from Committees with recommendations to remove which may happen on some, if it's still necessary, the Board is going to hear about it and that could stimulate a petition.

We got a lot of interest just by recommending to defer some things at this meeting, just for further study and there's nothing that will gather interest like recommending to remove something.

I guarantee that.

Before we -- yes, I'm sorry, Goldie. I think I have you on the list.

MEMBER CAUGHLIN: I guess what troubles me is that a lot of things would not have been approved had they not been annotated as we annotated them, number one. And there is no separating of the annotation from the appropriateness of that product.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

They are inextricably tied together. So it is a separate issue, no matter how safe that product is, we saw fit at the time we put it on there, or another Board did, that it was annotated because we didn't feel comfortable giving it a blanket type of thing.

And I think what we heard here today about the lidocaine and some of the other things is a good reminder that maybe users and certifiers also have to have a wake-up call. They jolly well are responsible for the reading of the proper use of those products with annotation. If it means that we have to come up with clarity in how they are listed on labels or whatever, the annotation is tied to it. It is not something that is just ho hum. And I think that's very appropriate that this is the time for that wake up call. Like you say, it isn't just things that we're looking at right at this moment.

When we first started five years ago, there was a great deal of discouragement to the Board, do not annotate, do not annotate, do not annotate. Well, it became too damn difficult. The fact of the matter was it was ridiculous. We had to in good

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

faith, in good workmanship frequently find that those products were something that we felt appropriate to approve, but they had to be annotated as specifically as they were. So we did cross a threshold somewhere it became along the line where more common And I don't think that is wrong. annotate. I just think that we have to find a way to deal with it once it's there.

think MEMBER KOENIG: Ι don't the annotations, it's not that all the annotations don't work. The annotations that we're having the most difficulty with that limit are annotations formulations, that in the annotation, in and it's itself, specifies \_\_\_ either aquatic plant extracts is a good example -- it's listed wrong. Ιf it's a certain pH adjuster or an extraction buffer, then that buffer should be listed.

So the problem is do you want us to perpetuate a bad listing or do you want us -- that's what I'm saying, how do we fix -- you know if you're going to say you'll work to fix it some other way and for us to proceed and don't worry about fixing things

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	with this process, that's fine, but we need to know
2	that we're not kind of rubber stamping a bad listing.
3	MR. NEAL: Barbara said what I was about
4	to say. We fix it outside of sunset through petition.
5	MEMBER WEISMAN: If that is true, then I
6	just want to have some clarification. Does that mean
7	that we're just doing sunset. Sunset is sunset and
8	that there will be no consideration of petitions until
9	after October 21, 2007.
LO	MEMBER CAUGHLIN: It doesn't mean that at
L1	all.
L2	MS. ROBINSON: Someone could be before
L3	this Board today, except it's not on your agenda.
L4	Someone could have brought a petition before this
L5	Board today.
L6	MR. NEAL: There will be petitions
L7	considered at the next spring meeting in addition to
L8	sunset.
L9	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: George?
20	MEMBER SIEMON: So of course, I can say a
21	lot, but I'm trying to play within the game rules and
22	obviously somewhere we established a policy that we

2 That was our own internal policy we adapted? 3 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: the Federal No, 4 Register, as I recall, did not say that. It was more 5 that the Board and the Program agreed that annotations 6 were not to be changed and really, the intent was not 7 to add or restrict use through the sunset process by 8 changing its annotation. The technical correction of an annotation 9 10 that's just plain wrong should be a separate issue, but it may not be. 11 12 So what Rose is saying in MEMBER SIEMON: 13 part is dealing with our work load. Where we got this, it's all fresh in our mind, so I understand 14 15 totally where she's going from the work load. 16 if somebody petitions on a deferred item between now 17 and the next meeting to deal with these kind of 18 issues, where would it go? Would we deal with it at 19 that time, since we're in the work load mode? Or20 would we not? 21 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: I think that would 22 trigger the process.

were not going to do annotations just to go back in

MEMBER SIEMON: So therefore the message is if there's any annotation issues on the deferred ones, now is a good time for someone to petition, is that right?

Then we would be dealing with annotations through that process. You asked what process could happen? There it is. We need someone in the public to petition on those items because I agree about the work load. We're going to have the TAPs in our hands. We're going to refreshed on these issues. Then is the time to do it.

### CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Rose?

MEMBER KOENIG: We are in agreement. concur with that idea. See, I look at some of these issues, it's a programmatic issue. If something is, for whatever reason, is not consistent with OFPA, and it's on there, or if something is an agriculture that's listed under title product а that nonagricultural, that's a programmatic problem. don't see why anyone in the public and no one's best interest or self-interest if something is wrong. It's your job, not our job.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. NEAL: Imagine NOP making an ad hoc
2	decision on yeast.
3	(Laughter.)
4	That's not a programmatic decision.
5	(Laughter.)
6	Some say it's listed wrong.
7	MEMBER CAUGHLIN: It's suicide.
8	MEMBER KOENIG: That's a good point. So
9	you aren't going to do anything, okay.
10	(Laughter.)
11	Good thing I'm getting off the Board. I
12	guess I can start the petition.
13	(Laughter.)
14	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay. Now before we
15	start the first presentation and first on the agenda
16	will be Livestock Committee. I have a few things I
17	would just like to get clear. One is Rose already
18	mentioned that if any of you have a unique interest in
19	a substance that's coming up before us, I'm going to
20	leave the burden on you to bring that up and reveal
21	it. I'm not going to repeat it every single time that

something comes up.

So we'll rely on you to bring it up at that time hopefully. So that's one thing.

The other is the whole concept of dealing with something while it's fresh in our minds is something that I've tried to do as Chair and that is vote on a topic when it's being discussed, when we've reached conclusion of debate. And right now the voting tomorrow which would agenda says mean revisiting everything tomorrow. I'd rather we, if we reach conclusion specific Committee on а recommendation or а section of Committee I'd like to recommendation, go to a vote, there's a reason that the Committee needs to meet and change and we need to bring it back up again tomorrow.

So that's how I would propose, unless we discuss on Executive Committee call in October and agree that that would be the best way to proceed. So does anyone have objection or concern with that plan?

MEMBER KARREMAN: So you're saying we're actually voting today on these things?

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Right, each of the ones that are ready to a vote, unless they're being changed

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	by a Committee, I would like to be able to vote as we
2	go along instead of having to revisit everything again
3	tomorrow, despite how much fun that could be.
4	(Laughter.)
5	MEMBER KARREMAN: That's fine. I mean
6	it's just not on the agenda that way.
7	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: I understand that.
8	MEMBER KARREMAN: You might want to check
9	with NOP. I don't know.
10	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Well
11	MEMBER KARREMAN: Fine. I don't care.
12	MS. ROBINSON: You set an agenda and
13	notify the public. So how are you going to vote?
14	People may be coming specifically to hear votes at
15	certain times. I know it's more convenient to do it
16	the way you want to do it, but people have signed up
17	to come tomorrow and to hear votes on certain things.
18	I would feel a little more comfortable if you kind of
19	stick to it the way it's already set up.
20	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay, I am hearing
21	objections. Overruled. No, I'm overruled. Not you.
22	That's fine. It's just sometimes I like common

1 sense.

MS. ROBINSON: In the future, just for the record, I would prefer you do that.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: That is what we have in the year I have been Chair. This kind of fell through the cracks in how the agenda got structured. Anything else? That's how we'll do it. We'll only talk today and we'll vote tomorrow and hopefully we won't forget about what we talked about between now and then.

MEMBER O'RELL: I think it would certainly be helpful if we take this to the point of discussion at least for those recommendations that we can, if we can get to total agreement and kind of just leave it there and say okay, we're here ready to vote, but because the way the agenda is published, we will vote tomorrow so that we don't have to go through a total repeat.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Yes. So we will be identifying, if there are any outstanding issues or changes to the drafts today.

Okay, thanks for that.

(Laughter.)

So Mike, are you ready to begin the Livestock Committee presentation?

MEMBER LACY: Jim, I do want to first of all thank the entire Livestock Committee for their hard work on the recommendations. In particular, I want to thank Nancy for putting together the drafts; Rose, for her help and advice to the Committee getting their recommendations together; and also to Arthur, for his able assistance. We couldn't have done any of this without a lot of people's help.

On the very first one, I'm just going to read the Committee recommendation. Ours are pretty straight forward, but we would be, the Committee would be glad to answer any questions or give any rationale that we can give, but in the interest of time, I'll just stick with the recommendations and then we'll answer any questions that you have.

Just as a clarification edit, I think right above where it says Committee recommendation we've got four lines there that are sort of -- some input from Rose and we need to delete that.

We had deleted what she was questioning.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

That no longer is in there and we just need to delete her aside.

So to begin with, the Livestock Committee recommends the renewal of the following substance in use category: alcohol, that would be ethanol, isopropanol, then aspirin, biologics, chlorhexadine, chlorine materials, electrolytes, glucose, glycerin, hydrogen peroxide, iodine, magnesium sulfate and phosphoric acid.

The Livestock Committee recommends deferring the vote on oxytocin and parasiticides. And the vote on that was 5 yes, 0 no, 0 abstained.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Nancy?

MEMBER OSTIGUY: I don't remember at this point all of this, the discussion, but to be consistent with the recommendations of the other two Committees, I would like to see chlorine materials moved to deferred and that way we'll look at chlorine materials as a group for all purposes, rather than splitting it off as we have it now.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: And that was consistent with my understanding from earlier today that the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	reports are in and it applies to all three categories.
2	So if the Committee would consider that
3	before bringing it back up for a vote tomorrow. Any
4	other comments on Julie?
5	MEMBER WEISMAN: I had a question about
6	ethanol being on the list. Is there a reason why
7	organic alcohol can't be used for this purpose?
8	MEMBER LACY: I don't know. Can anybody
9	help me out with that?
10	MEMBER KARREMAN: I think in veterinary
11	procedures, if I use ethanol, I think other
12	veterinarians out there in practice may not really
13	have any need to get organic alcohol except for maybe
14	one farm. So I would take that into consideration if
15	it's for veterinary use, but maybe from farmers' point
16	of view, I don't know. I won't answer for that.
17	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Rose?
18	MEMBER KOENIG: If it's listed, it's
19	considered synthetic.
20	If it's not for food use, organic is not a
21	requirement. I mean once a substance is on there,
22	except in the area of handling and commercial

availability, there's -- I don't know if that answers.

MEMBER CAROE: My question with the alcohol, is it perhaps being used as a solvent with some other listed material for application purposes? I don't know. It's a pretty universal solvent, alcohol. I don't know if something is dissolved in it for using topically or is that happening? Because that mixing may happen at a pharmaceutical or something.

**MEMBER** KARREMAN: Yes, absolutely. There's -- first of all, you have the alcohol prep pad, so if you want to give an injection to an animal, it's always wise to use an alcohol prep pad or you know, dowse them with a bottle of alcohol. That would organically available, easily, for not be practitioners, let's say. But also, there's botanical that definitely have alcohol tinctures base, there's more and more that do have organic alcohol in them for sure. And I source them and some other veterinarians do as well. But I don't think you can split that out here.

MEMBER KOENIG: Are you questioning

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	whether it's synthetic or not?
2	MEMBER KARREMAN: Commercial availability.
3	MEMBER KOENIG: Even if it wasn't on
4	the handling side, eventhe issue wouldn't be
5	synthetic. The issue is organic and nonorganic. But
6	I understand the you know, it's a different. There
7	are pharmaceutical issues and it's not a food, it's
8	not an ingredient. It's not a food.
9	MEMBER WEISMAN: What you're saying is
10	valid. The organic is not valid. We don't even need
11	to go there on this, because if it's on the list, that
12	means that it's considered synthetic, okay?
13	MEMBER KOENIG: My only question is is
14	there a reason why organic alcohol can't be used
15	MEMBER WEISMAN: Forget the organic
16	because it's either synthetic so you're saying
17	there's ethanol out there that you believe is not
18	MEMBER KOENIG: There's organic alcohol
19	that's highly commercially available which I know it
20	was not when this list was created. So I mean I think
21	that's a legitimate sunset.
22	MEMBER KARREMAN: I don't see that

commercially available, organic alcohol. I don't see sourcing my veterinary supplies.

MEMBER KOENIG: Let me go back to that. Get rid of the organic, okay? On the livestock material, this list is either -- these materials are synthetic. That's why they're there. If you know that there's an alcohol that's produced that you can use in veterinary medicine that is not considered a synthetic based on our -- we have a somewhat working document on this definition synthetic, shouldn't list ethanol.

The reason why it's there says that any form of ethanol can be used because we're acknowledging that there's not a natural form out there, so I think your question is valid. Your organic, that doesn't matter a hill of beans, okay? It's whether it's natural, nonsynthetic or synthetic.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Arthur and then Nancy.

MR. NEAL: Just to kind of clarify what Rose is saying, the organic commercial availability issue only relates to food processing. So the only thing that really matters here -- are there

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

alternatives? That's something that should be considered before placing it on the list.

MEMBER KOENIG: Can I call up Zea perhaps or someone in the audience who might have historically been there when this was reviewed? Or Emily?

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Emily is raising her hand.

#### MEMBER KOENIG: Brian?

MR. BAKER: Brian Baker. Organic Materials Review Institute and Technical Advisory Panel reviewer in the 1995-1996 and I don't think I was representative to certify a representative on the NOSB at the meeting where it was discussed, but I was certainly present at that meeting.

What Rose said is much the basis for the recommendation to add it to the National List. Ethanol can come from the fermentation of sugars, but can also be synthesized by the reaction there ethylene. And recognition that was а pharmaceutical grade ethanol is at times synthetic sources and that in any event, just to be on the safe side so that certifiers' hands weren't tied

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	and they didn't have to go through an additional
2	process of reviewing the ethanol being used for the
3	applications described by Hugh as a matter of
4	expediency, ethanol was put on the National List as a
5	convenience.
6	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Thanks, Brian. Nancy?
7	MEMBER OSTIGUY: I would also then like to
8	move ethanol to the deferred list and we can explore
9	this issue.
10	MEMBER KOENIG: If we are discussing it,
11	I'm not in favor of that. I think that provided the
12	explanation, because I just don't think it's a
13	practical thing to spend our resources on because the
14	veterinary-grade stuff is just probably not going to
15	be the same. It still goes back to the FDA, stuff you
16	can use on animals is a stricter code than we can use
17	ourselves.
18	(Laughter.)
19	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay. Bea? Dave?
20	MEMBER CARTER: I also oppose deferring
21	because I think there's a difference between synthetic

and organic

and

nonsynthetic

22

whole

this

and

discussion. Unless you want to make the case that using an alcohol prep on beef cattle is a food contact surface.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER CAROE: Could you go over the two materials that were put on the list to defer and what -- I didn't see any comments on those materials, but maybe I missed them. Were those items that were identified by the Committee as needing more information or were they -- did you receive comments?

MEMBER LACY: We received comments. There were comments on those two.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: There is discussion of it in the Committee Summary.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: Several commentators stated that chlorhexadrine, chlorine materials, oxytocin, ivermectin and hydrogen peroxide should be removed from the list.

MEMBER JAMES: I have a question, Nancy. You mentioned that you wanted to move the chlorine materials to deferral to match up with what some of the other Committees are proposing and 205.605 has it

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

as a renewal and 205.601 has it as a deferral and I just -- I'm a little confused as to exactly what and why we are moving chlorine materials to a deferral in two areas and not in the other and I'm also wondering why we would defer chlorine materials, in general, as a disinfectant for equipment and surfaces.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: I was going to recommend that we move for deferral the chlorine materials under 205.605(b) anyway. And the reasoning is based upon some of the comments from reviewers having to do with chlorine reactivity, etcetera. And doesn't mean that it wouldn't be renewed. It's just a matter of looking at more recent data because it happened. There's that we've not studies that are out considered previously.

MEMBER JAMES: Right, and I heard one of the lobbyists talk about how we're not consistent with our solutions, but I just have a little bit of concern about that.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: It is not that I am necessarily predisposed that they're going to come off the list. I just feel that we should evaluate the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

current data.

MEMBER KARREMAN: I am a little hesitant with deferring chlorine, actually, because it's such a vitally basic major compound for hygiene in the milk cows by state regulations and what not, cleaning dairy equipment and I don't think there's any alternatives, maybe there are some coming out, but I think it has to be kept in mind.

MEMBER LACY: Pardon me, the way I understand it, Jim has just suggested that we consider that which we will do at our meeting this afternoon and the Livestock Committee will decide whether to defer or not.

MEMBER CAROE: It would just make sense if we defer this material for any of the list, all that means is that we've requested more information on it. It doesn't make any sense to vote on it if we know we have more information coming in on it. We can approve it now or we can approve it later, if it's a good material. But if we've got more information coming in, why not just wait?

MEMBER JAMES: Is there a TAP review being

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	done on this?
2	MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
3	MEMBER LACY: That has already been
4	commissioned.
5	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Anything else on this
6	section?
7	MEMBER LACY: On 603(a)?
8	MEMBER OSTIGUY: I have a comment that I
9	want to make. We need to keep in mind that the goal
10	is is that everything that we are renewing or saying
11	will go off the list, that's all going to happen at
12	the same time. So we're not going to end up in a
13	situation where we won't have gotten around the
14	chlorine and it ends up going off the list because we
15	just haven't got there yet. That's not in the
16	projections.
17	MEMBER LACY: Okay, let's go on to 603(b)
18	and again, I don't think I prefaced it last time, but
19	these recommendations are made based on comments
20	received. The Livestock Committee recommends the
21	renewal of the following substances in this use

copper sulfate, iodine, lidocaine, mineral

category:

oil, and procaine.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

We recommend deferring the vote on hydrated lime. And again the Committee vote was 5 yes, 0 no, 0 abstained.

Any questions?

(Pause.)

Then will proceed to 603(c). on Recommendations made based comments Livestock Committee did not have -- there were substances in the category of recommending We did recommend deferring the vote on milk renewal. replacers and again the vote on that was 5, yes; 0, no; 0, abstained.

MR. NEAL: Two comments. One, just an update on lime hydrate. We have asked for a TAP on that. So we'll probably need to be in touch with you about what information you're looking for and with milk replacers, one of the questions is probably going to be is that a synthetic or is the issue a nonorganic milk replacer, because it may be listed wrong and that's something we have to think about.

MEMBER SIEMON: I was going to ask did the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Committee define what technical information they
2	wanted to know for milk replacers? It's kind of the
3	same question.
4	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: And this was one that
5	the Committee had already red flagged and I don't know
6	if we had come up with a list of questions yet. But
7	it's certainly something the Committee did do.
8	MEMBER SIEMON: I think we wanted to know
9	how to define emergency as well. That was part of
10	this. I just didn't know if there had been some more
11	technical
12	MEMBER LACY: It seems like it was a
13	question of whether there were organic substances
14	available.
15	Any other questions on 603(c)? Then
16	proceeding on to 603(d), recommendations made that are
17	based on comments received, the Livestock Committee
18	recommends a renewal of the following substances in
19	this use category: trace minerals and vitamins.
20	There were no other recommendations and
21	again the vote on that was 5 yes, 0 no, 0 abstained.
22	MEMBER KOENIG: I just wanted to ask the

1	Committee to consider the comment that came about on
2	the fact that both of those materials were added,
3	again, historical data without a review and it was
4	sort of they would just be placed on temporarily to
5	get them on there. I don't know if we considered
6	that.
7	MEMBER LACY: I don't think any of us were
8	aware of that.
9	MEMBER SIEMON: Didn't we clarify this in
10	2000? This wasn't just in 1995.
11	MEMBER LACY: That's what I was thinking.
12	MEMBER SIEMON: It was the first meeting
13	you were at.
14	MEMBER LACY: Yes.
15	MEMBER SIEMON: This talks about it being
16	'95, but it was in 2000 that we endorsed this to this
17	degree.
18	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Since 2000, yes, in
19	recent history.
20	MEMBER KOENIG: That was one there was a
21	TAP on it?
22	MEMBER SIEMON: There was no TAP in 2000.

1 MEMBER KOENIG: Could you approach and get 2 it on the record? 3 MEMBER SIEMON: I didn't say there was a 4 TAP. I'm just saying it wasn't something we did in 5 1995. It was something we did consciously in 2000, 6 knowing there was a TAP, as compared to what was said 7 in 1995. 8 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Brian? 9 MR. BAKER: Right and OMRI's comment 10 there's been no TAP review. There remains confusion 11 about the standard of identity and it's not clear 12 what's being discussed here. It's not clear what 13 what restrictions apply, particularly limitations, 14 with other regulatory language and in other contexts 15 and OMRI respectfully requests that a TAP review be 16 conducted on these substances. 17 MEMBER SIEMON: On every one of these, for 18 example, your list here, all these is what you're 19 saying? First decide whether 20 MR. BAKER: 21 categories are appropriate and whether a case-by-case 22 review is involved. Some of these are available from

organic sources. Some of these are available from nonsynthetic of these from sources. Some are genetically modified sources. It is very difficulty to distinguish between all of these different sources. of the Some them are on Food and Drug Administration's 21 CFR list. Some of them are approved the Association of American Feed Control officials and are not on 21 CFR.

So there is confusion there as to what FDA approval means. Of course, we recognize that the NOSB made its recommendation in 2000 and we are using that recommendation as guidance, but I can assure you that not everyone is clear or consistent on what that guidance means or how it is being implemented.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Do you still have something to add, Arthur?

MR. NEAL: It is kind of directed at Brian's request and concern. It sounds like Brian's concern is more of a clarification that he seeks which could be restricting or it could be expansive which is not necessarily part of sunset, but a part of reviewing those materials for further changes.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

We're very aware of the issue that you're discussing, some people want to know about and I think you're probably talking about proteinated chelates which the Board has already addressed in a recent meeting that proteinated chelates are already approved for use through this listing. But if you want to go further and you want to open that back up again, I don't think the sunset is the place to do it.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: George?

MEMBER SIEMON: Just the way we left it was we approved them, but then we identified the ones with concerns and then we TAP reviewed them, kind of went at it the opposite way, acknowledging that some of these need to go off. So we need petitions on these to take them off, rather than go through the whole list. That's just the way we did it, right or wrong. And that's why we looked at proteinated chelates and the other ones. We identified the ones and we did TAPs on them, just to get a listing.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: And then I have Kim and Zea to offer some further background.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MS. DIETZ: A point of confusion, now that
2	I'm out here.
3	The sunset process, we agreed on a
4	process. The Committees were charged with
5	recommending materials that should be deferred, based
6	on contentious areas, whether there were not, a public
7	notice went out. You were supposed to receive
8	comments and based on those comments, recommend to
9	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: For the record, who are
LO	you?
.1	MS. DIETZ: Kim Dietz. Recommend to
_2	continue to allow or remove. And what I'm seeing now
.3	is that you're actually up here deferring materials
4	that didn't go through that public process and I'm
.5	questioning the process because what's going to happen
.6	is if you defer materials now, how is the public going
.7	to know you deferred and have an opportunity to give
.8	public comment on them?
_9	So it's just a little bit confusing. I
20	don't really know if there's a problem with that, but
21	you've made a recommendation to allow the chlorine
2	issue just because the other Committees deferring you

1 want to defer handling and the others, I'm not sure 2 that's consistent if you've got no negative comments 3 from the public on those materials. 4 Out here, it seems a little jumbled. 5 MEMBER KARREMAN: In livestock, there was 6 one person and said synthetics should be off the list 7 for each and every product that we have to address 8 that. 9 But people had 30 days MS. DIETZ: 10 the recommendation and you heard comment 11 comments until today's public comment about taking 12 something off or deferring it, so just make sure 13 however you continue that you give people the opportunity to say what they want to say on it. 14 15 MEMBER OSTIGUY: There were comments to 16 defer chlorine that came in for all uses. 17 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: And the Board, 18 ourselves, have made a recommendation on this. And I 19 have Zea and then Rose. 20 MS. SONNABEND: Zea Sonnabend, former TAP contractor. We did in 1995 or 1994, start reviewing 21 22 some of the livestock minerals, particularly.

remember setting our reviews for cobalt manganese or some of these individual things. But what we found and what you have from Brian is although it came in to us to review as cobalt, when you start looking into where it comes from, it's cobalt acetate, cobalt carbonate, cobalt sulfate, and like 12 different forms of just cobalt. And so if cobalt is just one of the many vitamins and minerals that you're talking about, that's where the NOSB got quandary and went well, how do we know whether cobalt carbonate is better than carbonate manganate, know, like that. And so that's when it was decided to led 2000 them all together which to the decision.

But there are some old -- I have some documents about several of the minerals back at home, however you decide to re-review them.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Rose?

MEMBER KOENIG: Yes, I would just like to address both Kim and -- as far as the chlorine stands, we have new information. I think it's a conservative approach because we've already paid money to get the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

second for information, look at it before we make a decision and then have to go back. So again, deferral is not denying. It's basically saying hold off, we're getting new information, why rush into decision. We're looking at the same material in three years.

As far as comments, at all times we look at comments from the public. We would like it to be the form of a <u>Federal Register</u>, but we were even told by Barbara, it's not that we don't consider comments after that time, it just certainly improves the process if we can get them as we're going through it procedurally.

So I think that accepting public comment regarding materials, whether it's new information or it's responsibility to consider our information and that's what we're doing. We're not obligated to necessarily follow the comments, but we certainly want to consider that information. And that's all I'm saying is that in the terms minerals, we've heard some discussion. We certainly can discuss it more, but this may be that Committees would like to discuss a little bit more

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

before we finally vote on them tomorrow.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Bea?

MEMBER JAMES: I was just going to say I think part of the confusion that came about earlier when we were listening to one of the lobbyists talk about a material that he was concerned about because it was deferred and I think in the public's eye deferral is kind of a red flag. And I don't think we've ever really documented anywhere, I just checked in the Foreign Policy Manual. We haven't really documented what deferral means. And what is going to happen to that material when it is in deferral. probably need to do that so that going forward, there's not going to be this confusion around deferred products still can be used. It just depends on how -what happens once you get more information.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Yeah, and I'd like to respond because nothing happens to the material. It's still on the list. It's just giving the Board time to perform due diligence, thoughtful process, gather the information we need to have a solid recommendation.

MEMBER JAMES: Sure and I understand that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

now. But I don't know that a lot of people who have been making comment fully understand what deferral means, because it seems like they're still trying to defend and rightfully so, you want to give information and feedback and defend your item, but I just think that we need to make sure that we are clear about what we mean about deferral going forward. So maybe that's something we need to, at some point, look at in the Board Policy Manual.

MEMBER KOENIG: I just want to say that I think the sunset policy is clear. It should be clear to people to understand that. And I think within our documents when people voted, we didn't say these are being deferred, but it's in that Committee summary that some of it will say additional, technical information. And if people don't understand it, that means a deferral, those are the ones that get voted for deferral. So it's in the documentation. And then whether people can't understand, that's a whole other issue, but I don't think it has to be a --

MEMBER CAROE: I just have a question and maybe Kim, you can answer this. When chlorine was put

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

on the list or maybe Brian or Emily, when chlorine was put on the three lists that it's on, was it one petition that put it in those three places or was it separate petitions?

The reason I ask that is it makes perfect sense, what you say Kim about getting public comment, but if we're saying that we need more information on this material list, then it would on one inconsistent for us not to say we need it in the other So I see both sides of it and I don't know which the Board wants to go with, but it seems to me this was one petition and it was put on all And if it was one petition put on all three lists. lists, I think it should be looked at for all three together as well in the sunset.

Zea Sonnabend. MS. SONNABEND: It was. it came into the process from the different Committees, it was three requests to have a TAP review for all three Committees for chlorine, but only one TAP review was done because the issues are substantially similar. And it was discussed all at one time and voted on all at one time.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

### 1 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Mike? 2 MEMBER LACY: We will go on to 603(e). 3 Recommendations made that are based upon comments 4 received. The Livestock Committee recommends the 5 the following substances renewal of in this use EPA list for inerts of minimal concern. 6 category: 7 And there were no other recommendations deferring or 8 not renewing. The Committee vote was 5 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain. 9 10 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: 604 and then I think 11 it's time for a break. 12 205.604, Committee MEMBER LACY: 13 recommendation based on comments received, the 14 Livestock Committee recommend prohibiting the use, 15 continue prohibiting the use of strychnine. 16 recommendations in this category. The vote was 5 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain. 17 18 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay, any other 19 comments, questions? Hearing none, thanks, Mike, for 20 the presentation and discussion and let's --MEMBER CAUGHLIN: Where did we leave the 21 22 issue of the minerals and the vitamins? Is it going

1	to be discussed in meeting or just left?
2	MEMBER LACY: The Livestock Committee I'm
3	sure will discuss it again. As it stands now, I think
4	we are going to stand with our recommendation of
5	leaving it on the list.
6	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: As a Committee member
7	I'd like to review the comments we have received again
8	and at least consider those seriously here this
9	afternoon.
10	Okay, well, let's take a 15-minute break,
11	so to 3:35.
12	(Off the record.)
13	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: If people could take
14	your seats, please, I'd like to resume business.
15	
	(Pause.)
16	(Pause.)  CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay, next up is the
16	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay, next up is the
16 17	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay, next up is the Handling Committee and so Kevin, would you please
16 17 18	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay, next up is the Handling Committee and so Kevin, would you please present your Committee's draft recommendation.
16 17 18 19	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay, next up is the Handling Committee and so Kevin, would you please present your Committee's draft recommendation.  MEMBER DELGADO: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a

1 I understand the whole situation. So if a material is 2 deferred, does that mean we can sit on it for eternity 3 or does the clock keep ticking on? What's the answer? 4 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: The clock continues to 5 tick for its sunset which will be October 21, 2007, so 6 the pressure is still on the Board to deal with the 7 substance and I would anticipate that six months is 8 about the max that a substance -- a decision would 9 need to be made by that time in order to go through 10 the federal notice, the rulemaking process after the 11 Board's recommendation. 12 So about six months from now or a year out from October of 2007, so by October of '06, all action 13 should be done on these deferred materials. 14 15 MEMBER DELGADO: Thank you. 16 O'RELL: 205.605(a) first **MEMBER** 17 recommendation coming from the Handling Committee for 18 nonsynthetics allowed. The Committee summary 19 brief. There were certainly many comments that were 20 made as broad categories for keeping all materials on In addition, each of the substances that 21 205.605(a).

were listed on 205(a) received many specific comments

recommending their continued allowance and organic handling.

One substance, yeast, had several comments supporting the continued use of this material, however, there were a few comments objecting to its continued use.

There were also comments that were submitted, just to address those that were supporting the continued use of agar agar and tartaric acid. Both of these materials were inappropriately listed in the ANPR sunset review in the <u>Federal Register</u>, but because these materials were not on the December 21, 2000 list, they're not to be considered as a part of this sunset review. So --

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: If I could just add to that, if people don't -- they were added to the National List later, so they're on a different sunset track, but not relevant at this time.

MEMBER O'RELL: Correct. The Committee's recommendation was for the renewal of the following substances in this use category as they are published in the final rule. Do I need to read through all of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

those? Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Since we are going to vote, you might as well.

MEMBER O'RELL: I saw he set that precedent, but he had shorter lists.

I won't read the annotations. The annotations are the ones as listed in the final rule.

Acids, bentonite, calcium carbonate, calcium chloride, carrageenan, daily cultures, diatomaceous earth, enzymes, kaolin, magnesium sulfate, nitrogen, oxygen, perlite, potassium chloride, potassium iodide, sodium bicarbonate, sodium carbonate, waxes, nonsynthetic, and yeast.

There were several comments about yeast. The comments that came in for yeast in terms of against it continuing on the list of 205.605(a) really were indicating that it should be moved to another list or that it was no longer agriculture, that it should go to 606, but as we've heard before, our role in the material, sunset material review process is not to make assessments and evaluations of the list, if it should be classified in another section of that list,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

nor can we make determinations on agriculture or non-agriculture. That's still an issue is in the process of being determined and it's not part of sunset review. Therefore, the Handling Committee recommended the continued use of this material.

The Handling Committee voted to defer the following materials until either additional technical information could be attained or additional further reviews were done of historical information, particularly for flavors.

The two materials we're talking about deferring were for colors and flavors and there has been, as Arthur said earlier, a TAP review that has come back now on the flavors section that we'll be addressing.

Go ahead, Arthur.

MR. NEAL: Just to let you know, a preview of of those reviews is that real general information, just about what those categories are, what they contain. So when you all have opportunity to review them, we'll be interested in seeing how you feel that they fit your needs.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MEMBER O'RELL: And on flavors, it was
2	also pointed out in a comment that in 1995, there was
3	significant discussion in the 1995 NOSB meeting around
4	flavors and we want to be able to review that
5	historical perspective as well.
6	There were no substances in this category
7	that at this time we are recommending for not renewing
8	and the vote for this recommendation was 4 yes, 0 no,
9	no abstentions, one absent.
10	Any questions or discussion?
11	MEMBER SIEMON: Just a couple of
12	questions. First on the flavors. Is the TAP review
13	going to look at there's annotation about they
14	can't use synthetic, but are they going to look at the
15	whole issue that are there nonsynthetic ones,
16	basically? It's not just these things, acetic salts,
17	solvents, there might be other things that are used in
18	there that make them synthetic.
19	Has that also been addressed?
20	MEMBER O'RELL: This is flavors for
21	nonsynthetic sources only.

MEMBER SIEMON: But I'm asking are they

1	addressing that they are truly nonsynthetic?
2	MR. NEAL: If memory serves me correct
3	MEMBER SIEMON: That's the issue. That
4	was '74 and now we're doing a TAP review.
5	MR. NEAL: This looks at flavors, in
6	general. There are nonsynthetic flavors. There are
7	synthetic flavors. There are hundreds and hundreds of
8	flavors out there and what this report does is give
9	more information about the category of flavors.
10	What the Board has to wrestle with is how
11	does it want to renew flavors on the National List
12	because we know that there are organic flavors out
13	there and by flavors being listed on 205.605(a), that
14	could cause some confusion. We've got an ag versus
15	non-ag issue of synthetic versus non-synthetic issue.
16	MEMBER SIEMON: Right.
17	MR. NEAL: So there are a lot of things.
18	But this report only gets at general information about
19	flavors and some technical information about their
20	listings and categorizations.
21	MEMBER O'RELL: But again, in the process
22	of getting that technical information and looking at

it, as I understand it, it's our charge to look at the category use and the annotation that exists today and make a decision going forward as to whether the material continues or comes off the list, because I agree with you, Arthur, we know that there are some organic flavors which those come specifically from an agricultural source. But there are also natural flavors that do not come from agricultural sources, but nonsynthetic sources.

MR. NEAL: Correct, and like I said, once you receive the report that will have to be wrestled it didn't with because get into commercial availability or a lot of alternatives, flavors are produced that are natural? How many flavors are produced that are synthetic? It doesn't get into that type of detail.

So the continued listing of it, like I said, is going to have to be wrestled with.

MEMBER SIEMON: Then I just wanted to ask about yeast. Here's the place where we could have changed the annotation, be based on an organic substrate or something like that and one way we could

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

have dealt with that. So here's a place where somebody could petition to change annotation to be organic substrate or whatever because we deal specifically with a substrate here. So that would be one of the --

MEMBER O'RELL: Somebody could absolutely petition for using organic substrates only in the fermentation. That could be one annotation or somebody could petition to have it removed from 605(a) and be considered for 606 as an agricultural product.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Andrea?

That is MEMBER CAROE: the kev. The comments that we received on yeast were really not annotation related to the or an inappropriate annotation, but the whole question of the ag versus non-ag that we've been wrestling with. So it's a separate issue that we are dealing with. It's not part of the sunset process.

MEMBER SIEMON: I just -- I did look through the four inches of comments, but in your summary here, was there people who spoke specifically against some of these that you're recommending to

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

	$oldsymbol{1}$
1	renew?
2	I don't see any comments besides for yeast
3	that would have said
4	MEMBER O'RELL: No, there were
5	MEMBER SIEMON: Against these. Was there
6	any sense of that?
7	MEMBER O'RELL: From the analysis that we
8	did in looking at all of the comments, we found no
9	other comments. The only comments that were against
10	items were yeast.
11	MEMBER SIEMON: Okay, that's what I asked,
12	thank you.
13	MEMBER O'RELL: And even the ones that
14	we're deferring, even the flavors and the colors
15	received considerable amount of support and letters
16	for their continued use, but no opposition for any
17	other items.
18	MEMBER SIEMON: Thank you.
19	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay, moving on, Kevin.
20	MEMBER O'RELL: 205.605(b) synthetics
21	allowed, again, in the Committee summary there were
22	many comments just across the board for all of the

materials in 205.605(a) and (b). In addition, many of the substances on 205.605(b) continue -- had comments recommending their continued allowance in organic handling.

Many commenters supported the continued use of lecithin bleached, however one commenter did object to that based on the fact that there is an organic version of lecithin and as we heard today, even for an organic version of lecithin bleached.

We felt at the time, that there was not enough evidence supplied with that comment to support removal of lecithin bleached from the list, based on questions of functionality, form and quality. But we did feel that it was something that the Committee needed more time to investigate and to review and as Committee recommended deferring such, the this substance until additional information could be obtained.

Again, ethylene, there was in the same scenario there were many comments that supported the continued use of ethylene, however, there was one commenter who objected to its continued -- to the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

continued use of ethylene.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And the Handling Committee wanted to conduct a further review of historical documents and there was a TAP that was done on ethylene, but the Committee received it pretty late in the game and as Rose had indicated, we were trying to get our public, our recommendations published for the public 30 days prior to the meeting, so at that point in time, in order to move the recommendation through, we agreed to defer ethylene.

There was also potassium tartrate made from tartaric acid. There were a number of people who supported the continued use of that, but as commenter had indicated, that it was really duplication in the list that potassium tartrate was the same as potassium tartrate made from tartaric acid. And it was redundant, so we are recommending to not renew potassium tartrate made from tartaric acid.

Then again, there were numerous comments in terms of change of classification of items, and/or annotation. These included glycerin, xanthan gum, tocopherols. Again, the classified information

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

reviewed these comments and felt that they are not part of the sunset review process and moved forward to continue them on the list.

The Committee recommendations, the Handling Committee recommendations for the renewal of the following substance in this use category as they are published in the final rule and I'm not going to read the annotations. Alginates, ammonium bicarbonate, ammonium carbonate, ascorbic acid, calcium citrate, calcium hydroxide, calcium phosphates, carbon dioxide. did list Now chlorine materials in this. We can discuss this when I get done with the list in terms of what was brought out before with one TAP review that covered several use categories. We may want to consider deferring that item.

Ferrous sulfate, glycerides, glycerin, hydrogen peroxide, magnesium carbonate, magnesium chloride, magnesium stearate, nutrient vitamins and minerals, ozone, pectin, low-methoxy, phosphoric acid, potassium acid cartrate, potassium carbonate, potassium citrate, potassium hydroxide, potassium

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	iodide, potassium phosphates, silicon dioxide, sodium
2	citrate, sodium hydroxide, sodium phosphate, sulfur
3	dioxide, tartaric acid, tocopherals and xanthan gum.
4	For deferral, the Committee recommended
5	deferring ethylene and lecithin bleached. The
6	lecithin bleached discussion came up after review on
7	the 606 list. When we got into further information
8	about potential commercial availability of organic
9	lecithin and also an organic lecithin bleached, we
10	went back and revised our original recommendation to
11	take lecithin bleached from the renewal list and put
12	it on the deferred list.
13	And then the Handling Committee had
14	recommended for not reviewing potassium tartrate made
15	from tartaric acid because it is redundant.
16	And that vote was the original vote was
17	5 to 0, with no abstentions. Then we had a motion
18	brought to the table to relook at the lecithin
19	situation. That vote was 4 yes, 0 no, 1 absent.
20	Discussion? Questions?
21	MEMBER DAVIS: Ascorbic acid. Is that a
22	misspelling on that list?

1 MEMBER O'RELL: That is a typo. So many 2 eyes see this. 3 MEMBER SIEMON: You had said something 4 came out about chlorine just now? I didn't hear what 5 -- would you repeat what you just said about chlorine? 6 There was some issues raised. I thought I heard you 7 say that. 8 MEMBER O'RELL: I was just stating that 9 the earlier, previous discussions surrounding chlorine 10 and the fact that we have a TAP review coming in to 11 cover the whole subject area of chlorine across crops, 12 livestock and handling, that it -- we would need to 13 discuss among the Committee, but it might be the Committee's recommendation to defer chlorine in light 14 15 of that upcoming TAP. 16 MEMBER SIEMON: And will that happen by 17 tomorrow then? 18 MEMBER O'RELL: We are meeting tomorrow 19 We have a joint meeting tomorrow morning morning. 20 with the Policy Development Committee. I think this 21 discussion would probably take two minutes and to come

to agreement.

1	MEMBER SIEMON: The other one is a food
2	contact definition and food contact where it's not
3	you have very clear about food contact services
4	there, but I don't know if it's true or not, but I've
5	heard that chlorine is used in rinsing vegetables.
6	That would fall under this bigger category as far as I
7	understand and I know it gets to the heart of the food
8	contact thing, but I would look at this and say that
9	it wouldn't be allowed for that purpose, the way this
10	is read here.
11	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: I would agree. This
12	annotation doesn't allow that use, but the annotation
13	in the crops list is for post-harvest.
14	MEMBER SIEMON: Is that where it would be?
15	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: It could apply.
16	MEMBER SIEMON: Post-harvest? Would it be
17	under crop though?
18	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: I believe how that's
19	being allowed.
20	MEMBER SIEMON: Then with the ethylene, is
21	there any chance, I know you all have reviewed the
22	TAP. Any chance that you're ready to move that into

1	the recommended for renewal?
2	MEMBER JAMES: I have a comment.
3	MEMBER O'RELL: Let me just answer the
4	question. Is the comment related to ethylene?
5	MEMBER JAMES: I don't want to make that
6	decision until we're done with our discussion.
7	MEMBER O'RELL: I guess what I would say
8	is, George, we deferred it for a reason. We deferred
9	it so we would have the time to be able to have proper
10	discussion and due diligence on this issue. And to
11	review the prior TAP to see if we may even want to
12	request additional or updated TAP. So my feeling is
13	no, it's going to be deferred.
14	MEMBER SIEMON: All right.
15	MEMBER JAMES: I reviewed all of the
16	handling comments that were submitted and I don't
17	remember seeing anything in there about chlorine
18	materials. Now Nancy says that they were referred in
19	every section and
20	MEMBER O'RELL: If somebody made a blanket
21	one and maybe somebody has that reference because I
22	have the same list, Bea. I've gone through and I

1	haven't seen anybody
2	MEMBER CAROE: We do have a blanket.
3	MEMBER O'RELL: There's a blanket one.
4	MEMBER CAROE: And I can pull it out, but
5	I mean that means we could be deferring every single -
6	_
7	MEMBER KOENIG: There was one and again,
8	that would be an interpretation whether you would
9	consider sprouts a handling issue or a farm, post-
10	harvest. But specifically, there was a long comment
11	that was presented on the use of chlorine and sprouts,
12	post-harvest.
13	MEMBER CAROE: It might have been in the
14	category of crops then.
15	MEMBER KOENIG: Again, some of the
16	comments just by the nature, there were three groups
17	and then there was a group that overlapped where it
18	was pertinent to that and hopefully people looked in
19	that group also because there was some that was
20	multipurpose, yes.
21	MEMBER OSTIGUY: And my memory is that it
22	was in the multipurpose group.

MEMBER JAMES: Well, I just think that we also need to take into consideration and I don't have everything memorized well enough to be able to go in here and say okay, under such and such, but I know it's in here somewhere that when you're dealing with food safety, that there are allowances for certain things and I think that this is one of ingredients and I understand that we have a problem with the dilution of the dilution not being regulated closely enough, but I just -- I have concerns about making this blanket deferral all just across categories, without there being --

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Nancy.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: The deferral is not at all in my view a prelude to nonrenewal.

MEMBER JAMES: I understand that.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: And one of the comments that was made was that there are alternative products for disinfection and my personal reaction is that we need to consider that. If there are disinfectant processes that don't require chlorine, it is incumbent upon us to look at those. And if they're not

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

effective, okay, then that's a decision to say that chlorine still is just fine.

MEMBER JAMES: Okay, and I understand that. I just want to make sure that when we decide to do a blanket deferral the way we've done here that that -- I don't really understand that process and it concerns me a little bit because I don't necessarily agree that deferral in one category means that it should be deferred across all. So that's my concern.

MEMBER KOENIG: Again, it is a conservative approach. We've paid X amount of dollars to do a TAP, okay?

By all means, if somebody wants to make a motion tomorrow and without looking at that TAP or considering that information, by God, do it, you know? I may not vote for it, but go ahead and do it, but all I'm suggesting is that there's nothing wrong with looking, if you got the information, let's look at it and that's all we're saying.

MEMBER JAMES: Absolutely and I just would like to also just for the record say that if there are other ingredients out there that are more friendly

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 towards organic production, that are similar 2 sterilizing as chlorine, that we would also look at 3 the possible misuse of those dilutions and what that 4 would result in. 5 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Kevin, then Nancy. 6 MEMBER O'RELL: Actually, Rose has covered 7 what I said. I just think it's part of our due 8 diligence because we know it's there. As far 9 alternatives being for chlorine, that's fine, really 10 true, that's great. But as far as like disinfection 11 for milkhouse-type hygiene for public health, 12 know, I hope we're not kind of basing an up or down 13 vote on chlorine based on one study of an alternative. There better be a bunch. 14 15 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Is Nancy still in line 16 here? 17 MEMBER OSTIGUY: First, my recommendation 18 to pull this to deferral was not a blanket across all. 19 It was based upon the individual categories and the 20 uses within those categories.

NEAL R. GROSS

There are alternatives to chlorine for

It depends on particular situations,

disinfection.

21

whether or not they meet the criteria in whatever situation you're after. And that's what has to be considered.

MEMBER KOENIG: I was just going to say to remind people and it's probably more educate the new Board Members because you haven't seen of the TAPs that have come back contractors that we are using, they're basically in this case would be doing a full TAP where they are going to particularly look at alternatives and if you that, Hugh, you don't feel that there's sufficient studies or they haven't done a complete job, you have that 21 days to kind of ask specific questions.

So you should pay particular attention to those things, same with your -- so all of this is good process and what I'm saying is just remember it when it comes to our -- to the point where you've got that 21 days to get the answers to your questions because that's the opportunity that will be presented to you. So take advantage of it.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: And for new Members on

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the Board, I just point out that we did have a Chlorine Task Force report which provided a lot of background which also warranted or we recommended rereview in accepting that report and I'll send that around to everybody as well for further background.

Anything else on that?

MEMBER O'RELL: On 605(b)? Seeing none, we're going to go to 205.606 and July is going to take us through the lead on 606.

**MEMBER** WEISMAN: Ι will read the non-organically Committee's summary for produced agricultural products allowed as ingredients in or on processed products labeled as organic or made with food organic in whatever specified ingredients Many comments were received supporting the groups. retention of all five substances on 205.606.

In addition, comments were received opposing the relisting of all the substances on 205.606. These comments did not include adequate information supporting the removal of substances from the list as specified in the <u>Federal Register</u> notice regarding the sunset of materials on the National

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

List. And so the Committee felt that it did not have data or evidence to support the position to remove any of the substances listed in 205.606.

Four of the five materials on the list received a substantial number of comments in favor of their continued need in organic handling. Several commenters cited that some substances were available in organic form such as soy lecithin and had concerns that there won't be a market for the organically-produced substance if the non-organically-produced substance remained on the list.

However, there were other commenters who noted that the organic form was either not sufficient in quantity, which may be we already have additional information or inadequate in form which I don't know that we've heard anything yet that removes that concern.

No comments at the time that we were evaluating the comments provided adequate data to support their position.

And I will say a little bit more. We gave a little more consideration. Soy lecithin received

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

conflicting comments regarding its availability in a sufficient form. There was a TAP review of soy lecithin in 1995 that we looked at. It didn't really provide adequate information to help the Committee to make a determination for removing or continuing. And in light of that, the Committee recommended that this substance be deferred until further information could be obtained. I think some of which we heard this morning.

Comments specifically opposing the continued use of corn starch, gums, water-extracted only and kelp were based on the commenters' assertion that these items are now commercially available in organic form. But the information, again, such as functionality, supply source, supply quantity, address performance, test data and name and of producers who have used this material under similar circumstances, similar conditions was not supplied by those commenters for the Board to be able to make a decision to discontinue the use of these materials under 606.

In addition to that, along the same lines,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	there also were no comments received from
2	manufacturers or supplies of those substances
3	regarding their availability in appropriate form,
4	quality or quantity. And again, because such
5	information was not provided among the comments that
6	we received, the Handling Committee recommends the
7	continued use of these materials.
8	There were no comments specifically
9	opposing the continued use of pectin high-methoxy.
10	Therefore, the Handling Committee
11	recommends the renewal of the following substances in
12	this use category and I won't read for consistency
13	sake I won't read the annotations. Corn starch, gums,
14	kelp, pectin. The Handling Committee recommends
15	deferring the vote on the following materials and that
16	would be lecithin unbleached and there were no
17	materials in the category to discontinue being listed.
18	The Committee vote was 4 in favor, none
19	opposed, one absent.
20	Any questions? Wow.
21	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: You covered it, I guess.
22	Okay, so that concludes the Handling Committee's

1	presentation of draft recommendations. So we will
2	move on to Crops and Nancy, will you be taking the
3	lead here? Okay.
4	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Okay, starting with
5	205.601, synthetic substances allowed for use in
6	organic crop production, category use A as algaecides,
7	disinfectants and sanitizers including irrigation
8	systems and cleaning systems. The Crops Committee
9	recommends the renewal of the following substances:
10	alcohol, ethanol, isopropanol, ozone gas, periacetic
11	acid, soap-based algaecides and demossers. The Crops
12	Committee recommends deferral on the vote of the
13	following: chlorine materials and hydrogen peroxide.
14	Any comments?
15	MEMBER CARTER: I am easily confused, but
16	I'm wondering now, first of all, the number of ozone,
17	going through here, what's the significance of
18	enumerating the labeling?
19	MEMBER OSTIGUY: It is the number on the
20	current list, so the current National List.
21	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: What happened to three?
22	MEMBER OSTIGUY: I forget, but that's

1	where I pulled it from.
2	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: I'll check it out.
3	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Oh, well, the things that
4	are I think something got put in there though.
5	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: That wasn't on the
6	original
7	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Correct. So it's not one
8	of the sunset items, if I remember correctly.
9	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: George?
LO	MEMBER SIEMON: I need to understand why
L1	hydrogen peroxide is being deferred?
L2	MEMBER OSTIGUY: For the same reason that
L3	chlorine materials are being deferred. There were a
L4	couple of comments by the public concerning hydrogen
L5	peroxide being very reactive and whether or not it was
L6	appropriate to have it on the national list. And so
L7	purely for the reason of being able to fully consider
L8	public comments is the reason why it's been deferred,
L9	not because there's any expectation that it ultimately
20	would not be removed.
21	MEMBER SIEMON: But what technical
22	information are you going to ask then on hydrogen

peroxide?

MEMBER OSTIGUY: I couldn't tell you right now.

MEMBER SIEMON: It seems good with respect to the public, but if they don't have any kind of question or there's really any doubt in the Committee, I don't understand why we defer it.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Rose, then Dave.

MEMBER KOENIG: I mean in case of hydrogen peroxide when we know specifically there may be this one comment, the Committee may be able -- we don't necessarily have to engage our TAP contractors. Nancy, myself may be able to simply answer that question. It's just we didn't have enough time to get this job done, plus answer those technical questions. And we just want to address it. It doesn't mean -- it just means we need to gather a little bit more information.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: In fact, I don't believe we need to send hydrogen peroxide out for a TAP. I don't think that that was ever part of the discussion within the Crops Committee. But we just did not have

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 time to document why -- what our position would be to 2 recommend either a renewal or removal. We need that 3 justification for the NOP and since we didn't have 4 time to do that, it's on the deferred list. 5 **MEMBER** CARTER: Again, point of 6 confusion about this. This -- Zea was talking about 7 hydrogen peroxide being in the wrong place on the 8 list. Is this the area? 9 MEMBER OSTIGUY: No. 10 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Rose. 11 MEMBER KOENIG: Again, this is just 12 doing the due diligence needed on these materials. 13 took the comments very seriously. If we felt that there was some merit to the comment, but didn't have 14 15 the time to do the conversation, we just put it in 16 deferral, especially in crops, because there are so 17 many materials we have to file through. Middle 18 hanging fruit was the suggestion. 19 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Moving on. 20 MEMBER OSTIGUY: Category use (b) 21 herbicides, weed barriers as applicable. The Crops

Committee recommends the renewal of the following use

categories: herbicides, soap-based; mulches and we recommend the deferral of mulches -- I need to do the secondary parts of this.

The Crops Committee recommends the renewal of herbicide soap-based and mulches, plastic mulch and covers, number two on the list and then the deferral of mulches, newspaper or other recycled paper without glossy or colored inks.

And again, the reasoning for the deferral is similar. We have information on this. We did not have time to review it before things needed to be posted on the web.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Carry on.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: Okay, as compost feed stock, the Crops Committee does not have -- recommends following renewing the substances in this use category. Actually, we are sort of contradictory As compost feed stock, newspaper or other here. recycled paper without glossy or colored inks. And we have no deferral items in this category.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: And there, I guess if there is going to be some further review of newspaper

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	and colored inks where they're used as mulches, why
2	not also defer as compost feed stock.
3	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yes.
4	MEMBER CAUGHLIN: Were the comments that
5	were received just in
6	MEMBER OSTIGUY: No. I believe I
7	corrected this, but the right version did not end up
8	going where it needed to go.
9	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: So that is likely to
10	change before tomorrow.
11	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Before tomorrow, yes.
12	The Crops Committee will have to talk for a moment or
13	two.
14	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Andrea?
15	MEMBER CAROE: I am sorry, I need to go
16	back to the last recommendation because on the first
17	page of the last recommendation it says you're
18	deferring no materials, none in this category
19	MEMBER OSTIGUY: You have to look at
20	there's another subheader, recommendations based upon
21	comments received and then recommendations based not
22	on comments received.

1	MEMBER CAROE: Thank you.
2	MEMBER OSTIGUY: As animal repellents, the
3	Crops Committee recommends the renewal of soaps,
4	ammonia and there are no items that are being
5	recommended for deferral or nonrenewal.
6	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Continue.
7	MEMBER OSTIGUY: As insecticides,
8	including kerocides or mite control, the Crops
9	Committee recommends the renewal of the following:
LO	ammonium carbonate, boric acid, elemental sulfur, lime
L1	sulfur, soaps insecticidal, sticky trap barriers. The
L2	Crops Committee is recommending deferral on oils
L3	horticultural.
L4	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: George?
L5	MEMBER SIEMON: What happened to copper
L6	sulfate? Is that because it was not put
L7	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: That was added later.
L8	MEMBER OSTIGUY: As insect management, the
L9	Crops Committee recommends renewal of pheromones.
20	There are no items recommended for deferral or
21	nonrenewal in this category.
22	Moving on, as rodenticides, the Crops

1	Committee recommends the renewal of sulfur dioxide,
2	Vitamin D3. There are no materials that are being
3	recommended for deferral or nonrenewal.
4	Going on, as slug or snail bait, the Crops
5	Committee doesn't have any recommendations in this
6	category because there aren't any.
7	As plant disease control, the Crops
8	Committee recommends the renewal of the following:
9	copper fixed, copper sulfate, lime sulfur, periacetic
10	acid, potassium bicarbonate, elemental sulfur,
11	recommending the deferral of oils horticultural and no
12	materials are being recommended for nonrenewal.
13	We're also recommending based upon
14	inconsistencies with OFPA, deferral of the following
15	materials: hydrated lime, hydrogen peroxide,
16	streptomycin and tetracycline.
17	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: George?
18	MEMBER SIEMON: To the inconsistency is
19	not fitting into the 10 categories or
20	MEMBER KOENIG: Basically, the that was
21	based on that document when I went through and again,
22	II

1	That in disease control, the coppers were
2	specifically listed under the OFPA categories, but
3	there really isn't any other category, so if there's
4	an agreement in terms of the interpretation of those
5	categories, then we probably can find a place for
6	hydrogen peroxide and hydrated lime.
7	Or as somebody suggested, the way it was -
8	- I guess with the Bordeaux mixture, just kind of
9	confusion. So there are things that we've got to
10	analyze on those two and then streptomycin and
11	tetracycline, they're basically antibiotics because
12	those are bacterial diseases.
13	MEMBER OSTIGUY: And while OFPA doesn't
14	make a specific prohibition on antibiotics we
15	don't have a category. And the Board did make a
16	statement, so we need to remedy that.
17	MEMBER KOENIG: And there is no OFPA
18	category for antibiotics.
19	MEMBER OSTIGUY: But it is plant disease
20	control.
21	Tocsin is not an antibiotic. A tocsin is
22	a product that is made by an organism. There is a

legal definition.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER KOENIG: The mode of action is different.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Andrea.

CAROE: I just question MEMBER these inconsistencies, are they part of the scope of sunset? Are we looking at -- should these materials be listed Not the categories, not -- I mean if it's or not? inconsistent with OFPA because it's prohibited, understand that. If we -- if OFPA specifically says you can't have antibiotics and there are antibiotics for is be deferred sure an issue to ultimately should be recommended and not be renewed, but the inconsistencies of where they're listed, I just feel that that should be a separate action.

MEMBER KOENIG: Agreed. We just need to discuss it and we're acknowledging that's the issue. We're deferring it so that we can rectify the issue and bring it forth back. You know, but at the point where the Committee was, we were trying to facilitate the ones where there were no issues. Again, I think

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	we're going to be in consultation with the NOP on this
2	and figure out what is the correct process. And you
3	could be 100 percent right. The conclusion may be
4	just go ahead with sunset and we'll deal with it in
5	some other function. But we want to make sure that we
6	know clearly where we want to go on those.
7	MEMBER OSTIGUY: The Committee will be
8	looking at this before tomorrow.
9	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Are you asking for a
10	Crops Committee meeting?
11	MEMBER OSTIGUY: We already said we were
12	going to.
13	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay, well, then we need
14	to set that before we recess for the day here.
15	MEMBER OSTIGUY: To continue on, assuming
16	that we are finished with as plant disease control, as
17	plant or soil amendment, the Crops Committee is
18	recommending the renewal of elemental sulfur,
19	magnesium sulfate, micronutrients and vitamins B1, C
20	and E. We're deferring until later lignin sulfinate
21	and there are no materials not there are no

materials recommended for nonrenewal.

We also have recommendations that were not based upon comments received and we're recommending a deferral of aquatic plant extracts, humic acid and liquid fish products.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Could you or Rose explain a little bit more why the Committee recommended deferral of those three just again? Not to go into great detail, but just to refresh.

Rose?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER KOENIG: Well, basically on the lignin sulfinate, one commenter said that it shouldn't the National List because nonsynthetic exist for the alternatives substance which were aeration, bubblers or other gentle agitation.

Additionally, the commenter stated that if the material is allowed, no residue should be allowed on the product. And then we, in general, wanted to review these extraction — these materials, humic acid, liquid fish products and aquatic plant extracts, just in terms of — as one of the commenters stated coming up that the annotations on them seem to have a lot of confusion to the industry and if you look into

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	the historical notes on them, at one time on aquatic
2	plant extracts, other than hydrolyzed was the
3	acknowledgement that there were natural forms of that.
4	We want to make sure that as a commenter
5	did provide some information that he wasn't aware of
6	any manufacturers of natural products that were being
7	marketed, but we need to make sure that number one, if
8	there is a natural alternative out there, that the
9	information is still current on that, in general, and
10	that is true of a lot of those three issues. They all
11	have to do with extractions and we thought it would be
12	wise to kind of get an overview.
13	MEMBER CAUGHLIN: This does indicate that
14	these were based not on comments received, but you're
15	saying that not directly from a comment, but because
16	of a these were ones that remember, initially, the
17	Committees have the option to kind of earmark those
18	substances that they felt were
19	MEMBER KOENIG: I understand that you were
20	referring to comments.
21	MEMBER CAUGHLIN: Well, the lignin
22	sulfate, I read that one because that was generated,

1	but the comments that I was speaking of was the public
2	comment that Mr. Hilts
3	MEMBER KOENIG: Right, I was thinking
4	about that.
5	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay.
6	MEMBER OSTIGUY: As plant growth
7	regulator, the Crops Committee recommends the renewal
8	of ethylene gas for the regulation of pineapple
9	flowering and there are no deferrals or nonrenewals
10	recommended.
11	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Andrea?
12	MEMBER CAROE: Ethylene gas is one of the
13	materials that is going to be looked at, is it
14	appropriate to defer it here as well?
15	It will be looked at for handling.
16	MEMBER OSTIGUY: I can go either way.
17	MEMBER CAROE: I don't know. I don't know
18	if it's appropriate for us to do that or not, but we
19	are going to be looking further material.
20	MEMBER KOENIG: What I would suggest is it
21	sounded like that was one that you guys were going to
22	discuss in Committee and that you had already gathered

some information on, so maybe you guys can just -- when you do that brief overview, we can make that determination.

It sounds like they may have sufficient information to make a determination and not have to do that review. Certainly, if you all decide to do a TAP, we may want to reconsider that. So it's something to put a little mark by and we'll determine that probably tomorrow.

MEMBER O'RELL: We're not going to have an answer from the Handling Committee tomorrow on that. We are going to review that information, but not here. I don't think we have the time so there won't be an answer from the Handling Committee on ethylene tomorrow. We would still -- except to defer it for the additional review, yes.

MEMBER JAMES: Even if the TAP review on ethylene comes back and it would impact reviewing it in this category, we could still do that even though it's not deferred here, correct? If we decide not to defer it?

MEMBER CAUGHLIN: If we renew it, it's

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	renewed.
2	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: The Board can reconsider
3	a vote.
4	MEMBER JAMES: Isn't it cleaner to simply
5	
6	MEMBER OSTIGUY: The Committee will look
7	at this also to see whether or not we will change the
8	recommendation for tomorrow morning.
9	MEMBER CAROE: If we are recommending to
10	put it on the list, it's on the list. I don't think
11	we should plan on going back and changing our vote.
12	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: You should never plan on
13	that.
14	MEMBER CAROE: That's kind of what I was
15	getting at is that we could go back and do that. I
16	think that's not an option we should even consider.
17	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay.
18	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Floating agents in post-
19	harvest handling. There are two items in this
20	category, both are being recommended for deferral,
21	lignin sulfinate and sodium silicate.
22	One commenter stated that sodium silicate

1	is unnecessary, that they've never encountered a tree
2	producer who has ever used it or requested to use it.
3	And then lignin sulfate was that there were
4	alternatives. So we wanted to investigate both of
5	those.
6	If there are no more comments on that,
7	going on to category M, synthetic or inert ingredients
8	as classified by the Environmental Protection Agency
9	for use with nonsynthetic substances or synthetic
10	substances listed in this section and used as an
11	active pesticide ingredient and in accordance with any
12	limitations on the use of such substance. The
13	Committee recommends materials in EPA List 4, inerts
14	of minimal concern.
15	There are no deferrals or recommendations
16	for nonrenewal.
17	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Hugh, did you have a
18	comment?
19	MEMBER KARREMAN: No.
20	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Okay.
21	MEMBER OSTIGUY: In that case we finally
22	finished with 205.601. 205.602, nonsynthetic

substances prohibited for use in organic crop production. The Committee recommends the renewed listing of the following substances: ash from manure burning, arsenic, lead salts, sodium fluoraluminates, strychnine, sodium nitrate, and tobacco dust. There are no materials recommended for nonrenewal and one is recommended for deferral, potassium chloride.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: And we did receive comment, a question this morning about the status of sodium nitrate for spirulina and when the Committee voted it was before October 21st, but now and we did, the Committee did discuss the status for spirulina and it's our understanding that after that date, it is no longer on the list. It is prohibited.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: And that is what the Committee intended, is that the sunset of October 21, 2005 is status quo.

# Arthur?

MR. NEAL: This is a general comment for all Committees. There are a number of substances that have been deferred. We just ask that if there's technical information that you're seeking, the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

technical contractors to review, will you make sure you let us know because at the next meeting, it's the last meeting we're going to be able to take recommendations for sunset.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Rose?

MEMBER KOENIG: I was speaking at the break with Kim and Julie, we were speaking and we were thinking it may behoove the Board to as we're putting those questions out to our technical contractors to somehow post it on the website so that the public is aware of the kinds of questions that we're asking so that they might be able to provide some additional technical information.

I just ask you to kind of give us feedback in which would be the most appropriate and best process to do that, but I do think that it does make a lot of sense to give the public the opportunity on all these deferred comments, to provide us with additional technical information, both for the technical contractors as they're evaluating materials and for the Board, in addition to certainly public comment once the reports are out and our

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

recommendations are made.

MR. NEAL: I think that that's a great idea. I think that you'll have to be very clear with your questions. I think that going out to the public for responses is more cost-effective than going to the contractors because some of these things may not even need full TAPs. But that's a decision you'll have to make as Committees.

MEMBER KOENIG: What I'm thinking is that we will, some of them may be just for public comment, but what I was envisioning is even some of these single questions, now if we have to pay \$4,000 to get a single question answered, I'll do the search on the internet, okay? And if that's the choice and I'll charge only \$2,000.

(Laughter.)

Until January, you've got my time for free. No, but that's fine. Give us the economics of that because I certainly don't want to be putting resources out to answer questions that we could probably figure out on our own. So if have to pay the full price, we certainly can research that.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. NEAL: It may not be for the full price, but depending on how specific you are with your questions, if it's a broad question, they've got to do hours of research and they don't know exactly which way to go, it can add up. That's what I'm saying. It depends.

CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Andrea?

MEMBER CAROE: I guess with these deferred materials and hearing the ones that were deferred by Committee, not by comment, a lot of them are based on some ambiguous annotations or some confusion about were they appropriate? I don't know what you want the TAP reviewers to tell you. What information are you looking for and who is the best to provide that if you think an annotation may be misunderstood.

The deferral to me was an opportunity to get more technical information, but --

MEMBER KOENIG: It's clear on the ones that we've put out there as Committees that we wanted full TAPs.

MEMBER CAROE: So you want a full TAP on aquatic plant extracts?

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2 CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: George, then Julie. 3 MEMBER SIEMON: A couple points. Arthur, 4 if we wanted to go to the bigger community, does that 5 mean we'd somehow post the questions we have before 6 the next meeting and say give input on these, we'd get 7 input from the community? MR. NEAL: Right, if you want additional 8 information, one of the things I can't be clear enough 9 10 on is you've got to be specific in what you want. 11 last couple of requests that we've put forward have 12 been just give me a technical evaluation. 13 And with colors and flavors, it was tough, because you can't prescribe a manufacturing process 14 15 because you don't have a petition. And because there 16 are so many, the only thing you can do is be general. like I said, I don't know how effective the 17 So 18 reviewer is going to be for you, so if you're going to 19 ask for additional information, you've got to be 20 specific because you still may not get what you want. I'm concerned about how we 21 MEMBER SIEMON:

MEMBER KOENIG: Yes.

engage the community out there because we'd have to

22

1	post it before they make the next recommendation for
2	the next meeting, so there would have to be some mid-
3	posting that these are the questions we want to have
4	answered. Please send your
5	MR. NEAL: Right. A couple of weeks after
6	this meeting, you'll have to go out with the posting
7	to have something before January or by January.
8	MEMBER SIEMON: Then I had a question
9	about potassium chloride. I see that a commenter
10	spoke against it and now you are all deferring it
11	which means it might be allowed.
12	MEMBER KOENIG: No, what it's saying is
13	that they're requesting the annotation allows you
14	to use it with that specific use and what they're
15	saying is it shouldn't be allowed in any form. Again,
16	that's a change of annotation.
17	MEMBER SIEMON: It's a change of
18	annotation.
19	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: It would be to remove it
20	from the list. It's a prohibited natural.
21	MEMBER KOENIG: So removing it as a
22	prohibited natural allows it.

1	MEMBER SIEMON: No.
2	MEMBER KOENIG: Yes.
3	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: If it's a natural.
4	MEMBER SIEMON: No, then it's flat
5	prohibited.
6	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: A natural. The listing
7	is a bit redundant because the natural, it's a reverse
8	
9	MEMBER CAROE: If you're removing it,
10	you're allowing it.
11	MEMBER SIEMON: So what was the
12	Committee's intent by putting this defer in?
13	MEMBER KOENIG: Actually, in this case, in
14	this case I think that this is a contradiction to our
15	policy on the annotations because the annotation
16	specifically, unlike all the other lists, and all the
17	other substances, this annotation actually narrows
18	do you understand what the problem is with this one?
19	MEMBER CAROE: It's the same thing. Keep
20	it on the list and then afterwards, fix the
21	annotation. It's a simple process.
22	MEMBER KOENIG: Okay, I guess you're

1	right.
2	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Julie, did you have
3	anything?
4	MEMBER WEISMAN: Actually, I think it was
5	addressed. Just a little bit of work to be done.
6	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Again, for the record, I
7	want to correct something I said about the spirulina.
8	I said after that date, it's prohibited for use in
9	spirulina and that would not be accurate for
10	spirulina. It would be still the same limitation as
11	any other crop of 20 percent of nitrogen. I just
12	wanted to correct that for the record.
13	Okay, that concludes the Crops Committee's
14	report and we
15	MEMBER SIEMON: Can we set up for our
16	Committee meetings?
17	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: Yes. So Livestock
18	Committee and it sounds like Crops also and then
19	Handling, you think you can handle that when you meet
20	in the morning, it's already scheduled at 8 a.m. in
21	the lobby is where we'll meet and then we'll go from
22	there. Handling and Policy Committees, 8 a.m. in the

1	morning.
2	MEMBER OSTIGUY: I'd like the Crops to
3	meet right now if we could.
4	MEMBER KOENIG: Fine with me.
5	MEMBER OSTIGUY: We're not going to have
6	time in the morning.
7	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: I know. The Livestock
8	is planning on right now. So could we say Crops in a
9	half hour and that's right now enough?
10	MEMBER KOENIG: 5:15 is fine.
11	CHAIRMAN RIDDLE: That keeps the pressure
12	on Livestock to get everything done in a half hour.
13	So is that all right? Livestock, we'll
14	just meet here, right away, and then Crops in a half
15	hour.
16	Thanks. All right, we'll recess for the
17	day we reconvene at 9 a.m. tomorrow as a full Board.
18	(Whereupon, at 4:43 p.m., the meeting was
19	adjourned, to reconvene tomorrow, November 17, 2005 at
20	9 a.m.)
21	